



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

No. 137

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 12, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

EPA'S REGULATIONS NEGATIVELY AFFECT JOBS AND THE RURAL COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, farmers, ranchers, and foresters take great pride in the stewardship of the land. They are the original conservationists. While it may be popular among some to blame farmers and ranchers for any and every environmental concern that crops up, I know that nobody cares more for the environment than those who work the land every day. When a

farm family's livelihood depends on caring for natural resources, there is an undeniable economic incentive to adopt practices to enhance the land's long-term viability.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has pursued an agenda seemingly absent of any recognition of the consequences for rural America and production agriculture. Obama's EPA is creating regulations that are burdensome, overreaching, and negatively affecting jobs and the rural economy.

Perhaps the most poignant example is the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers' recent power grab with the waters of the U.S. rule or, as the EPA calls it, the clean water rule. I will be frank, this rule is not about clean water. Everybody wants and deserves clean water. This rule simply embodies EPA's insatiable appetite for power. When EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy testified before the House Committee on Agriculture in February, members of the committee brought forth many concerns with the WOTUS rule. Numerous times Administrator McCarthy simply brushed off their concerns with statements that were intended to assure us that farmers would have the same longstanding farming exemptions that were originally included in the Clean Water Act.

These verbal assurances give little comfort to farmers and ranchers who will face steep civil fines for any violation. While the Administrator was telling the farming community that they have nothing to fear with the new WOTUS rule, a California farmer was being prosecuted by the Justice Department for simply plowing his field.

The lawsuit brought against this producer claims that by plowing a field, which every farmer I know considers a normal farming practice, this farmer has created, get this, "mini mountain ranges" in his field. These mountain ranges are furrows from normal farming. The suit also claims that this pro-

ducer discharged a pollutant into the waters of the U.S. This so-called pollutant was the soil he was plowing. These perceived violations only came to light when an overzealous court bureaucrat just happened to be driving by the property and discovered perceived WOTUS violations on the land.

Regardless of the degree to which some deem government regulation justifiable, all regulations must be developed in a manner that is based on science and mindful of the economic consequences. This rule clearly was not. Farmers, ranchers, and foresters believe the EPA is attacking them, and it is easy to understand why.

Instead of using the EPA and Corps' preferred strategy of fear and intimidation, coupled with punitive enforcement and overreaching regulatory authority, we should be building on the successful approach taken in the 2014 farm bill and previous farm bills to protect our natural resources through voluntary incentive-based conservation programs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5257

In this year of post-9/11, we pray that the children of this generation and their children's children may never have to experience another day like the one that flooded our TV screens so many years ago.

Protect and guide this Nation to a new security, built upon human integrity and communal solidarity with all who love freedom and human dignity, while respecting the lives and beliefs of others.

Empower the Members of Congress and governments around the world to establish just laws and seek the common good that will lead to ways of equity and peace.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ZIKA FUNDING AND ACCURATE INFORMATION ARE PARAMOUNT TO PROTECT AMERICANS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I come to Congress this week with expectations that perhaps this is the week when, as elected officials, we will do the right thing for south Florida families and Americans across our Nation. Perhaps this is the week in which the Senate will finally pass the long-awaited Zika funding bill and then for the House to act, finally.

South Floridians are correctly pushing Congress to leave politics aside and to do our job to protect the public. We are already way late in doing so, Mr. Speaker.

I look forward to Governor Scott's meeting with our south Florida congressional delegation later this week, because the facts and figures related to how big a problem Zika is appear not to have been accurately reflected in the summaries provided by the Florida Department of Health, according to a report in the Miami Herald. Detailed, timely, and accurate information are needed to protect our communities from this epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass the Federal funding needed to fight Zika and ensure that State agencies are providing thorough and accurate reporting of local Zika infections.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, by the end of today, 90 people in America will have died from gun violence. That is beyond tragic. That is heartbreaking. That is 90 too many.

While House Republicans shamefully stand idle, I am proud to say that, in my district in the Silicon Valley, my hometown community hereby says: enough.

Several years ago, the city of Sunnyvale overwhelmingly passed critical, courageous, and commonsense gun violence prevention measures. Today, the city of San Jose is on the verge of adopting similar measures. I am proud that Silicon Valley is leading by example. It is time now for Congress to act.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow one more day to go by, and 90 people to die, without doing all that we can to end the epidemic of gun violence. Enough is enough. Give us a vote, Mr. Speaker. Give America a vote.

JEFF HENDERSON OLYMPIC GOLD

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeff Henderson, who won a gold medal in the long jump during this summer's Rio Games.

A native of McAlmont, the Mac Side, Arkansas, Jeff has been pushing himself to succeed since the humble beginnings of his athletic career. After graduating from Sylvan Hills High School in 2007, where he played football and ran track, Jeff surprised himself and his peers as he tore through the competition in both collegiate and professional track and field. His perseverance would not dwindle in Rio, and Jeff promised his mother, who is battling Alzheimer's, that he would bring home the gold.

After trailing other athletes during the majority of the event, on August 13, 2016, Jeff leapt his way to gold on the final jump, edging past the silver medalist by just 1 centimeter.

Our Olympic athletes in Arkansas and throughout the country made our Nation proud this summer, and I am honored to recognize today this Mac Side star, Jeff Henderson, for his historic accomplishment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN CONGRESS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Vice President JOE BIDEN said, "We are facing a simple reality; we are not doing the people's most urgent business." He is right. It is long past time that we take up this staggering list of unfinished business in this House.

The people in my hometown of Flint still can't drink the water that comes out of their tap, yet House Republicans have pushed off any meaningful action that would send help to this community in its moment of greatest need. Further, the CDC will run out of resources to fight Zika, with almost 17,000 Americans, including 1,600 pregnant women, infected.

Republicans in Congress continue to put their own partisan messaging agenda ahead of fighting Zika, helping the kids of Flint, and even with the opioid epidemic killing 78 people a day. We lose 78 young people a day. No action.

We have bipartisan approaches to all of these problems. This body is called together to do the people's work. We should take up this legislation, and we should do it now, Mr. Speaker.

MEDIA SHOWS THEIR BIAS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the media's credibility is at a new low, and it is self-inflicted. That is because they have set out on a maniacal mission to destroy anyone who doesn't bow to their political views. Why? Clearly, one person poses a threat to the media's liberal views. He wants to secure the borders; they want mass amnesty for illegal immigrants. He wants to reduce government regulations; they favor more government control. He opposes political correctness; they support speech police.

The liberal media think they know better than the American people what is good for them. Let's hope the voters won't let the liberal media tell them what to think or how to vote. The future of our democracy depends on a fair, balanced, and unbiased media.

FUND ZIKA

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I just returned after a weekend in south Florida where people wanted to talk about two things: remembering 9/11 and wondering why Congress can't figure out how to find the necessary funding for Zika.

This morning, Dr. Fauci of the NIH said that if we don't act, we are at risk of halting the investigation into coming up with a vaccine that can help prevent people from getting Zika.

After 9/11, everyone in this country was able to come together as one. We all remember how that felt. My colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, stood on

the floor just now and talked about the bipartisan support for funding research and a response to Zika. In this partisan body, let's remember how that felt to stand together, and let's stand together for the people of south Florida and the people in this country and do the right thing and pass a clean Zika funding bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE LIFE AND WORK OF ELIE WIESEL

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 810) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the life and work of Elie Wiesel in promoting human rights, peace, and Holocaust remembrance, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 810

Whereas Elie Wiesel was born in Sighet, Romania, on September 30, 1928, to Sarah Feig and Shlomo Wiesel;

Whereas in 1944, the Wiesel family was deported to the Auschwitz concentration camp in German-occupied Poland;

Whereas in 1945, Wiesel was moved to the Buchenwald concentration camp in Germany, where he was eventually liberated;

Whereas Wiesel's mother and younger sister, Tzipora, died in the gas chamber at Auschwitz and his father died at Buchenwald;

Whereas Wiesel and his two older sisters, Beatrice and Hilda, survived the horrors of the Holocaust;

Whereas after World War II Wiesel studied in France, worked as a journalist, and subsequently became a United States citizen in 1963;

Whereas Wiesel's first book "Night", published in 1958, told the story of his family's deportation to Nazi concentration camps during the Holocaust and has been translated into more than 30 languages and reached millions across the globe;

Whereas Wiesel would go on to author more than 60 books, plays, and essays imparting much knowledge and lessons of history on his readers;

Whereas in 1978, Wiesel was appointed to chair the President's Commission on the Holocaust, which was tasked with submitting a report regarding a suitable means by which to remember the Holocaust and those who perished;

Whereas in 1979, the Commission submitted its report and included a recommendation for the creation of a Holocaust Memorial Museum, education foundation, and Committee on Conscience;

Whereas in 1980, Wiesel became the Founding Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council and helped lead the effort for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to open its doors in 1993;

Whereas in 1986, Wiesel and his wife, Marion, created The Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity in order to fight indifference, intolerance, and injustice;

Whereas Wiesel, dedicated to teaching, served as a Visiting Scholar at Yale University from 1972 to 1976, professor at the City University of New York from 1972 to 1976, and Boston University from 1976 until his passing;

Whereas Wiesel has received several awards for his work to promote human rights, peace, and Holocaust remembrance, including the Nobel Peace Prize, Presidential Medal of Freedom, the United States Congressional Gold Medal, the National Humanities Medal, the Medal of Liberty, the rank of Grand-Croix in the French Legion of Honor, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Award; and

Whereas, on July 2, 2016, at the age of 87, Elie Wiesel passed away, leaving behind a legacy of ensuring a voice for the voiceless, promotion of peace and tolerance, and combating indifference, intolerance, and genocide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) extends its deepest sympathies to the members of the family of Elie Wiesel in their bereavement; and

(2) urges the continuation of the monumental work and legacy of Elie Wiesel to preserve the memory of those individuals who perished and prevent the recurrence of another Holocaust, to combat hate and intolerance in any manifestation, and to never forget and to learn from the lessons of history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when Elie Wiesel passed away this past July, the world lost one of its greatest champions of human rights and a tireless and powerful force against tyranny, hate, and intolerance.

This resolution honors Elie Wiesel's life, work, and legacy; extends our deepest sympathies to his family; and reaffirms his efforts to learn from the lessons of the past in order to prevent another Holocaust.

I want to thank my good friend, my colleague, STEVE ISRAEL, as well as PATRICK MEEHAN and my Florida colleague, TED DEUTCH, for their leadership in bringing this resolution forward, as well as Chairman ROYCE and

Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership in shepherding it through the Foreign Affairs Committee and now here to the House floor.

I was proud to work with Elie Wiesel on a number of issues over the years, including raising awareness about the Holocaust and the rise of anti-Semitism, as well as other human rights issues, and I was honored to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the Dalai Lama alongside Mr. Wiesel in the year 2007. Elie Wiesel had himself been awarded the Gold Medal in 1984, as well as the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nobel Peace Prize, and many other awards and honorary degrees.

A survivor of Auschwitz and Buchenwald, Elie Wiesel helped reveal the ugly truth about the atrocities that took place at Nazi concentration camps, detailing his experiences in one of his best-read books, entitled, "Night."

In that book, Elie Wiesel explained why he dedicated his life to Holocaust awareness, saying that to forget "would be not only dangerous but offensive; to forget the dead would be akin to killing them a second time."

Mr. Wiesel warned about what happens when the world is silent in the face of evil, saying that "we must take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented. Sometimes we must interfere."

Elie Wiesel was never afraid to interfere, raising his voice when others were silent in order to remind us, again and again, that human suffering, wherever and whenever it occurs, cannot and must not be ignored.

□ 1415

Whether it was genocide in Sudan, the plight of Tibetans suffering under the Communist regime in Beijing, or warning against the mullahs in Iran who continue to say that Israel should be wiped off the face of the Earth, Elie Wiesel was always there to speak out against tyranny. He was committed to ensuring that the oppressed and the suffering knew that they are not alone, that those without freedom, that those without human rights are not being ignored and are not forgotten by the outside world.

Elie Wiesel's legacy will endure as a reminder that people must never be ignored, that we must learn from the past, and that we must never be silent. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), my friend and the author of this resolution.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who was an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership and her support of this resolution, as

well as the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROYCE, for holding a markup on this and ensuring that it received a vote on the floor of the House. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) for being the lead original cosponsor of this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this resolution shortly after Elie Wiesel's passing because I wanted to ensure that my colleagues, my constituents, and citizens around the world would never forget the horrors of the Holocaust and the very special and unique legacy of Elie Wiesel.

Mr. Wiesel's tremendous impact has reached millions across the globe, and I believe he truly is one of the most influential and important figures of our time, perhaps of all time.

After surviving one of the darkest moments in history, he spoke up and offered a voice to the voiceless. He offered hope to people without hope. He spoke for the millions that we lost in the Holocaust, but also those who survived. He helped educate the entire world on the atrocities committed during the Holocaust, and he ensured, Mr. Speaker, that we would never forget.

He was born on September 30, 1928, and in 1944 was deported, along with his family, to Auschwitz. In 1945, he was moved to Buchenwald, where he was eventually liberated.

Unfortunately, tragically, many members of his family did not survive. His mother and younger sister died in the gas chamber in Auschwitz. His father passed away in Buchenwald. Only Wiesel and his two older sisters survived.

He went on to become a journalist. He published his first book, "Night," in 1958. I have read it many times. Through the book, he tells the story of his family's deportation to the concentration camps, and he illuminated the unthinkable atrocities committed by the Nazis.

He wrote the book not to reflect on the past, but to warn us about the future, to call out violations of human rights wherever and whenever they occur. And he didn't stop there. He published so many more books and plays and essays, and he helped all of us have a better understanding and learn from history.

Mr. Speaker, he also helped found the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and, along with his wife, Marion, created the Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity. Elie Wiesel was a true humanitarian, fighting against intolerance and injustice and leaving behind a legacy like no other.

I met him personally several years ago. I will never forget that meeting. None of us should ever forget his meaning in the world.

I am honored to have introduced this resolution in the House, and I know that my colleagues will support this measure in order to honor the life, work, and legacy of Elie Wiesel.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), our esteemed chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would begin by saying I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL). I appreciate his work here for authoring this resolution.

I think it, again, has been said, but his life's work, Elie Wiesel's life's work, cannot possibly be overstated. I think that for those who have called for us to remember, who have called for us to take action, no time is more probably important than today, when we see the anti-Semitism, when we saw the attacks in Paris, when we see these attitudes. People say never forget. That is correct.

Here are some of the words that he spoke when he was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1986. He said: "I remember: it happened yesterday or eternities ago. A young Jewish boy discovered the kingdom of night."

I think he was 15 at the time that he was held in the Nazi death camps of Auschwitz and later Buchenwald, 15 years of age.

He said: "I remember his bewilderment," speaking of himself. He said: "I remember the anguish. It all happened so fast. The ghetto. The deportation. The sealed cattle car. The fiery altar upon which the history of our people and the future of mankind were meant to be sacrificed."

"I remember," and he asked his father, "'Can this be true?' This is the 20th century, not the Middle Ages. Who would allow such crimes to be committed? How could the world remain silent?"

"And now the boy is turning to me," he said later in life as he reflected on this. "'Tell me,'" he asks. 'What have you done with my future? What have you done with your life?'"

"And I tell him that I have tried. That I have tried to keep the memory alive, that I have tried to fight those who would forget. Because if we forget, we are guilty." If we forget, then "we are accomplices."

So today, we honor his memory by committing to continue his work, to preserve the memory of those who perished in the Holocaust, to protect oppressed minorities that face other genocidal campaigns, and to promote the eternal values of peace, of tolerance, and of understanding for future generations. By passing this resolution, the House will commit to uphold Elie Wiesel's pledge to never forget.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her work on this resolution with Mr. STEVE ISRAEL.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for moving this bill swiftly through the committee to the floor.

I am proud and appreciative to have introduced this bill with my friends Congressman ISRAEL and Congressman MEEHAN, my colleagues on the U.S.

Holocaust Memorial Museum Council. It is a testament to Elie Wiesel's inspirational reach across our country that 158 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle joined us as original cosponsors.

In particular, I am grateful to my friend and colleague, Representative ROS-LEHTINEN, for her commitment to all of the ideals that Elie Wiesel lived out.

H. Res. 810 recognizes the incredible life of accomplishments of Elie Wiesel. Elie Wiesel was a legend, the kind of influential figure that changes people around him and leaves the world in a much better place. His story is taught in classrooms, his work is read by millions in dozens of languages, and his accomplishments are recalled in halls of governments around the world.

He lived through one of history's darkest moments. He survived Auschwitz and Buchenwald, scenes of some of the manifestations of the worst evil of humankind in modern history, and he went on to become an acclaimed writer, human rights activist, and Nobel laureate.

This giant of a man refused to stay silent as other atrocities took place around the world in the years following the Holocaust. From Rwanda to Kosovo, from Cambodia to Sudan, Elie Wiesel always spoke out because, as he put it, "I swore never to be silent whenever and wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation. We must always take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented."

The last sentence reverberates loudly around the world today: "Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the least we can do to respect and to honor Elie Wiesel's memory, so let's do more. Over 70 years after the Holocaust, bigotry and prejudice continue to plague societies around the world.

Anti-Semitism, the millennia-old hatred of Jews that spawned Hitler's Final Solution, can still be found today; anti-Semitism from Paris to Buenos Aires, from Malmo to Marseilles, to London, and anti-Semitism on the streets, online, and on college campuses.

Time after time, Jewish communities around the world are forced to make a decision: Is it safe for me to send my children to a Jewish school? Can we walk to synagogue without fear of the heckling? And might it be time for me and for my family to move from our neighborhood, our community, or even our country because of the antagonism and hatred and violence that forces us to flee, like other times in Jewish history?

I am proud of the bipartisanship that this topic receives from my colleagues and the widespread membership of the Bipartisan Taskforce for Combating Anti-Semitism, and I know that we will continue to use our platforms and

our tools to keep Jewish communities safe.

But the intolerance that Wiesel spoke out against wasn't limited to anti-Semitism. His life's experiences compelled him to focus our attention on any part of the world where innocent people are being targeted.

Five and a half years into the Syrian conflict, over 400,000 people have lost their lives; millions of others are displaced. Thousands of Syrian children born in the last 5 years now know only the life of living in a refugee camp or makeshift residences.

I am hopeful that the recently announced ceasefire will hold; but there have been some egregious injustices done to innocent Syrians by both the Assad regime and radical terrorist groups like ISIS. We cannot allow these violations to go unpunished, and we must pay attention to these atrocities every day, not only on the days when painful images of young children dominate social media, whether a refugee washed ashore or a bloodstained boy from Aleppo who has known only war.

Whether it is war in Syria, turmoil in South Sudan, systemic human rights violations in Venezuela or in Iran, or attacks on women and girls in too many places in the world, it is our duty to keep the attention and pressure on human rights violators and do everything we can to protect innocent civilians.

We must commit ourselves to promoting tolerance, speaking out against injustice, taking action against bigotry in all its forms, and upholding and living out the principle that comes from the Holocaust: "Never Again."

Elie Wiesel did his part and changed our world. Let's elevate Elie Wiesel's memory and continue his work. Silence encourages the tormentor. Today we speak out.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding to me. I rise in support of his resolution.

Let me start by thanking my colleague and friend from New York (STEVE ISRAEL) for his hard work on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, on July 2, a light went out of this world. Elie Wiesel was a champion of human rights, peace, and Holocaust remembrance. And though he is gone, his life and work and message are seared on our collective conscience.

Born in Romania in 1928, he survived the Sighet ghetto, Auschwitz, and Buchenwald. He was inmate number A-7713, and his number was tattooed on his arm. His mother and sister died in death camps.

When I was a little boy growing up in the Bronx, we had many people who

were Holocaust survivors, and they had tattoos all over their arms, on the other side of their wrists. I remember that very, very vividly, and it is something that has been seared into my memory through the years.

When Wiesel was liberated by the United States in 1945, he moved to France and then immigrated to America.

□ 1430

In 1955, while living in France, he wrote "Night," the story of his experience with his father in the Nazi death camps, and this book became the foundation of Holocaust literature. I would advise everyone to read this book. He was one of the first to put pen to paper to chronicle his own view of the darkest chapter in human history.

He won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1986. Upon giving him the prize, the Nobel Committee announced, "Wiesel is a messenger to mankind; his message is one of peace, atonement and human dignity . . . Wiesel's commitment, which originated in the sufferings of the Jewish people, has been widened to embrace all repressed peoples and races."

Wiesel's advocacy for victims of oppression around the world was his most recent legacy. He championed the cause of saving Darfur. He defended the Tamil people in Sri Lanka. He was outspoken against the Iranian nuclear program, and he spoke out for people around the world who were being mistreated.

Most recently, he dedicated himself to stopping the massacres of the Syrian people. He called for an international criminal trial against Assad, charging him with crimes against humanity. We on the Foreign Affairs Committee have seen documentations of those crimes against humanity of what Assad has been doing to his own people. Wiesel said that the public response to Assad's use of gas against the Syrian people was inadequate. I certainly agree.

Elie Wiesel constantly reminded us that indifference to the suffering of others is what allows evil to take hold. We must all take it upon ourselves to live Wiesel's legacy.

As was mentioned by my colleague before, anti-Semitism, once again, is rearing its ugly head around the world, and we have to speak out and condemn it and condemn all other kinds of discrimination as well. So never again—not to Jews, not to Syrians, not to African Americans, not to anyone.

This resolution honors the legacy of Elie Wiesel and reflects our commitment to carry his work and his message forward. It is important that we come together on this.

I remember when we had our annual Holocaust Remembrance services right in the Capitol discussing things with Elie Wiesel. We took a few pictures together. It is certainly something that I will cherish for the rest of my life.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to support this measure. I ask everyone to vote for it.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, through his writing, his work, and his life, Elie Wiesel helped the world know what transpired when Hitler tried to annihilate the Jews; and he lifted up the world in committing himself, and now all of us, to doing everything we can to ensure that nothing like that ever transpires again.

I am so grateful to my friend, Mr. ISRAEL, and to the other Members who coauthored this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard from every eloquent speaker before us, Elie Wiesel represented the best of humanity. He was someone who refused to allow human suffering to continue without protest, no matter the race, the religion, or the political views of the suffering. There you would always find Elie Wiesel's voice. He said: "There may be times when we are powerless to prevent injustice, but there must never be a time when we fail to protest."

Elie Wiesel dedicated his life to ensuring that we learn the lessons of the past, that we remember atrocities like the Holocaust, and that we refuse to allow indifference to condemn the oppressed to a life without the world's assistance or solidarity.

As we move to pass this resolution here today, Mr. Speaker, we reaffirm our commitment to Elie Wiesel's legacy to combating hate, to fighting against intolerance in all of its forms, and ensuring that we will never forget the consequences of indifference.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this important resolution, but I also urge my colleagues to take a moment to reflect upon Elie Wiesel's lifelong message and his mission. It is fitting that the House is acting today on this resolution honoring the life of this great man, Elie Wiesel, but later today will also be considering a resolution recognizing the plight of Holocaust survivors.

The United States has a responsibility and, indeed, a moral obligation to fulfill this legacy. For too long we have allowed human rights to merely be an afterthought rather than a driving force in our foreign policy. We can do better, and we must do better. Let's do so with Elie Wiesel in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following remarks from Elie Wiesel:

I remember: On April 18th, 1944 on a house to house operation destined to rob all Jewish families of their fortunes, a policeman and an elegantly dressed Hungarian lieutenant entered our home in Sighet and asked for all our valuables: he confiscated: 431 Pengös, our entire cash, 1 camera, my fountain pen, 1 pair of seemingly gold earrings, 1 golden ring, 1 silver ring, 3 ancient silver coins, 1 military gas mask, 1 sewing machine and 3 batteries for flashlights.

They dutifully signed a document, which I have in my possession, and left for my grandmother Nissel's home, two houses away.

She was a war widow. Her husband, my grandfather whose name Eliezer I try to wear with pride, fell in battle as a medic.

In mourning, a profoundly pious woman, she wore black clothes, rarely spoke and read Psalms uninterruptedly.

A similar official document listed HER valuables . . .

One Pengö, two coins, three smaller coins.

And two pieces of 21-cm tall solid brass candlesticks. That's all she possessed.

Bureaucracy was supreme and eternal even then: whether official murder or robbery, not fearing embarrassment or retribution, everything had to be recorded.

Why the Hungarian and German armies needed was her pitiful life's savings and her Shabbat candlesticks to win their war is beyond me. At times I am overcome with anger thinking of the red coat my little 8-year old sister Tsipuka had received for our last holiday: she wore it in Birkenau walking, walking hand in hand with my mother and grandmother towards . . . A daughter of an SS must have received it as a birthday present.

Just measure the added ugliness of their hideous crimes: they stole not only the wealth of wealthy but also the poverty of the poor.

The first transport left our ghetto one month later.

Only later did I realize that what we so poorly call the Holocaust deals not only with political dictatorship, racist ideology and military conquest; but also with . . . financial gain. State-organized robbery, or just money.

Yes, The Final solution was ALSO meant to remove from Jewish hands all their buildings, belongings, acquisitions, possessions, valuable objects and properties . . . Industries, art work, bank accounts . . . And simple everyday objects . . . Remember: before being shot by Einsatzkommandos, or before pushed into the gas-chambers, victims were made to undress . . . Six millions shirts, undershirts, suits, scarfs, pairs of shoes, coats, belts, hats . . . countless watches, pens, rings, knives, glasses, children's toys, walking sticks . . . Take any object and multiplied it by six million . . . All were appropriated by the Third Reich. It was all usefully calculated, almost scientifically thought through, programmed, industrialized . . . Jews were made to be deprived of their identity, and also of their reality . . . In their nakedness, with names and title and relations worthless, deprived of their self esteem of being the sum total of their lives both comprised all that had accumulated in knowledge and in visible categories . . .

When the war ended, what was the first response to its unspeakable tragedy? For us individual Jews, the obsession was not vengeance but the need to find lost family members. Collectively, in all DP camps, a powerful movement was created to help build a Jewish State in Palestine.

In occupied Germany itself, the response moved to the judiciary. The Nüremberg Trials, the SS trials, the Doctors trials. Wiedergutmachung, restitution, compensation: were not on the agenda. The immensity of the suffering and the accompanying melancholy defied any expression in material terms.

In liberated countries, in Eastern Europe, surviving Jews who were lucky to return to their homes and/or stores were shamelessly and brutally thrown out by their new occupants. Some were killed in instantaneous pogroms. Who had the strength to turn their attention to restitution?

Then came the Goldmann-Adenauer agreement on Wiedergutmachung. The first Israelo-German conference took place early 1953 in Vassenaar, Holland. Israeli officials and wealthy Jews from America and England

allegedly spoke on behalf of survivors, none of whom was present. I covered the proceedings for Israel's Yedioth Ahronoth. I disliked what I witnessed. I worried it might lead to precarious reconciliation. It did. The icy mood of the first meetings quickly developed in friendly conversations at the bar. Then also, deep down, I opposed the very idea of 'Shilumim'. I felt that money and memory are irreconcilable. The Holocaust has ontological implications; in its shadow monetary matters seem quasi frivolous. In the name of Israel's national interest, David Ben Gurion's attitude was, on the other hand, quoting the prophet's accusation of David, 'Haratzachta vegam yarashta': should the killer be his victim's heir? Logic was on his side, emotion was on mine.

In the beginning we spoke about millions, at the end the number reached billions. International accords with governments, insurance companies, private and official institutions in Germany, Switzerland and various countries. In Israel, local industry benefitted from the endeavor. As did needy individual survivors elsewhere too, including Europe and America.

Throughout those years, chroniclers, memorialists, psychologists, educators and historians discovered the Holocaust as their new field of enquiry. Some felt inadequate and even unworthy to loom into mystics would call forbidden ground. Having written enough pages on the subject, I confess that am not satisfied with my own words. The reason: there are no words. We forever remain on the threshold of language itself. We know what happened and how it happened; but not WHY it happened. First, because it could have been prevented. Second, the why is a metaphysical question. It has no answer.

As for the topic before us this morning. I am aware of the debate that was going on within various Jewish groups on the use to be made of the monies requested and received: who should get how much: institutions or persons? The immediate answer is: both.

However, it is with pained sincerity that I must declare my conviction that living survivors of poor health or financial means, deserve first priority. They suffered enough. And enough people benefitted FROM their suffering. Why not do everything possible and draw from all available funds to help them live their last years with a sense of security, in dignity and serenity. All other parties can and must wait. Do not tell me that it ought to be the natural task of local Jewish communities; let's not discharge our responsibilities by placing them on their shoulders. WE have the funds. Let's use them for those survivors in our midst who are on the threshold of despair.

Whenever we deal with this Tragedy, we better recall the saying of a great Hasidic Master: You wish to find the spark, look for it in the ashes.

(Prague restitution: unedited draft)

ELIE WIESEL.

ELIE WIESEL REMARKS, USHMM NATIONAL TRIBUTE DINNER, MAY 16, 2011

I've always believed that a human being can be defined by his or her openness to gratitude. For someone who has none, something is wrong with that person. I believe in gratitude, as a Jew, because in our tradition the first thing we do in the morning when we get up is recite a prayer of gratitude to God for making us realize that we are still alive.

Listening tonight to all you said about my work, I wonder whether words of gratitude are enough. Maybe I should compose a poem, or sing a song. It is more than rewarding.

Often my wife, the love of my life, and I discuss when I have to travel somewhere.

"Look," she says, "you are getting older." She doesn't say "old." "Maybe you should stop, it's enough." Then I try to make her realize that it's never enough.

And now, a story. And a poem. The poem was written by a very great Israeli author called Uri Zvi Greenberg and the poem, in Hebrew, is about Sipur al Na'ar Yerushalmi. This is the story about a Jerusalemite boy who one day turned to his mother and said, "Mother, I want to go to Rome." And the mother says "What? You are in Jerusalem! Why do you want to go to Rome?" "Mother, I want to learn something about Roman culture." In the beginning she refused. Then she gave in, but she said to him, "Look my son, you go to Rome. Do you know anybody there?" "No." "What will you do in the evening?" He said, "I don't know . . . I will go into the field and lie down and sleep." And she said, "Okay, but one thing I want you to take from me: a pillow, and when you lie down to sleep you will at least have a pillow under your head." He did, and every day, he left Rome, went into the fields, went to sleep, on his pillow.

One night, the pillow caught fire. That night, the temple of Jerusalem went up in flames. Can we live like that? That an event which takes place thousands of miles away has such an effect on us? That, I believe, is what the memory of the fire is doing to all of us. It makes us aware of all those who need us, all those who need maybe our words and occasionally our silence—but I mean silence in the mystical sense, not in a pragmatic situation when silence is forbidden.

What can we do with our memories unless these memories help others in their lives, in their endeavors? There is so much to remember. Sometimes it's not easy. Hegel spoke of the excess of knowledge. We have another problem: the excess of memory. It is simply too much, too heavy. We have here a man whose name should be remembered: Mark Talisman. He was vice chairman when I was chairman. I remember we spoke about it in our meetings: whom are we to remember? Naturally, first the Jews: they were the first victims, six million Jews. But we must limit that memory, which means what? I came up with an idea: that not all victims were Jewish, but all Jews were victims. So that means, as Jews, because we remember our Jewish tragedy, we make it more universal. That is the definition almost of our Jewishness: the more Jewish the Jew, the more universal the message.

And we worked on it here, and then we said okay, we remember the suffering, we remember the fire, but what about the next step? What did those who survived do with their survival? Their message is not a message of despair. It is a message of hope. We taught the world how to build on the ruins. Therefore, among the priorities that we had for this project was actually to give the survivors their place of honor in our society however we could, always for survivors first, not only because what they could say no one else had the authority to say, but also because they as human beings, as fathers, grandfathers, had something to say again, and it is almost impossible not to listen to them. And by the way, what Mark tells me now: there are survivors . . . Now of course many have done very well, and the fact is, what they have done among you, what they have done here in the Museum—the role of the survivors not only morally but also financially—is extraordinary. But there are survivors today who are still living in poverty, and I believe that we in this Museum should pay attention to that and do whatever we can to help them. And naturally, more than anyone else, we must feel empathy with those who suffer today, in Rwanda, in Darfur, in Cambodia . . .

I addressed the General Assembly, some ten years ago or more. I gave my address, entitled "Will the World Ever Learn?" and I came out with a very sad answer: "no." Because it hasn't learned yet. Had the world learned, there would have been no Rwanda, and no Darfur, and no genocide, and no mass murder. It hasn't learned, otherwise there would be no antisemitism today. Antisemitism is the most irrational, absurd emotion that one can encounter. Somewhere, anywhere, there is someone who hates me, although he or she never met me. He or she hated me before I was born, and here it is, still practiced in certain places.

But then because of our experience we must feel—and we have felt—those who suffer today from all kinds of diseases. Take children. What you said about my little sister is true: I cannot speak about her without shedding tears. Because of her, my major preoccupation are the children of the world. Whenever I espouse a human rights cause it always has to do with children. Every minute that we spend here tonight, somewhere on this planet a child dies of hunger, of disease, of violence, or of indifference.

Life is not made of years. Life is made of moments. Sara, you called them "formative moments." I simply say moments. At the end of my life, when I come to heaven, and there will be a scale, my good deeds, my other deeds, it's not my years that will be on the scale, but the moments. Some are good, glorious. Others are less so. Nothing of my life in this project—most of that experience was as rewarding. Every moment has its weight, has its meaning, and has left its legacy here in this extraordinary experience which the Museum is for anyone who enters it.

I remember during the inauguration, what President Clinton mentioned. I turned to him and I said he must do something about Sarajevo, about the tragedy in Bosnia. It was Clinton who later on, on television, spoke about the role of the citizen. And he simply said, "you want to know what a simple citizen can do? A simple citizen can change America's policy in the Balkans." He turned to me and said, "He did it."

What we can do with memory is of incommensurable importance. We really can change the world. And so, for these moments and for your kindness and for all the commitment to remembrance which is the noblest endeavor a human being can undertake: simply to remember the dead. To forget the dead would mean not only to betray them but to give them a second death, to kill them again. We couldn't prevent the first death, but the second one we can, and therefore we must.

And so, whenever we deal with memory, you should think that the pillow under your head is burning.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOAL OF ENSURING THAT ALL HOLOCAUST VICTIMS LIVE WITH DIGNITY, COMFORT, AND SECURITY IN THEIR REMAINING YEARS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 46

Whereas the annihilation of 6,000,000 Jews during the Holocaust and the murder of millions of others by the Nazi German state constitutes one of the most tragic and heinous crimes in human history;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Jews survived persecution by the Nazi regime despite being imprisoned, subjected to slave labor, moved into ghettos, forced to live in hiding or under false identity or curfew, or required to wear the "yellow star";

Whereas in fear of the oncoming Nazi Einsatzgruppen, or "Nazi Killing Squads", and the likelihood of extermination, hundreds of thousands of Jewish Nazi victims fled for their lives;

Whereas whatever type of persecution suffered by Jews during the Holocaust, the common thread that binds Holocaust victims is that they were targeted for extermination and they lived with a constant fear for their lives and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas Holocaust victims immigrated to the United States from Europe, the Middle East, North Africa, and the former Soviet Union between 1933 and the date of adoption of this resolution;

Whereas it is estimated that there are at least 100,000 Holocaust victims living in the United States and approximately 500,000 Holocaust victims living around the world, including child survivors of the Holocaust;

Whereas tens of thousands of Holocaust victims are at least 80 years old, and the number of surviving Holocaust victims is diminishing;

Whereas at least 50 percent of Holocaust victims alive today will pass away within the next decade, and those living victims are becoming frailer and have increasing health and welfare needs;

Whereas Holocaust victims throughout the world continue to suffer from permanent physical and psychological injuries and disabilities and live with the emotional scars of a systematic genocide against the Jewish people;

Whereas many of the emotional and psychological scars of Holocaust victims are exacerbated in the old age of the Holocaust victims;

Whereas the past haunts and overwhelms many aspects of the lives of Holocaust victims when their health fails them;

Whereas Holocaust victims suffer particular trauma when their emotional and physical circumstances force them to leave the security of their homes and enter insti-

tutional or other group living residential facilities;

Whereas tens of thousands of Holocaust victims live in poverty and cannot afford, and do not receive, sufficient medical care, home care, mental health care, medicine, food, transportation, and other vital life-sustaining services that allow individuals to live their final years with comfort and dignity;

Whereas Holocaust victims often lack family support networks and require social worker-supported case management in order to manage their daily lives and access government-funded services;

Whereas in response to a letter sent by Members of Congress to the Minister of Finance of Germany in December 2015 relating to increased funding for Holocaust victims, German officials acknowledged that "recent experience has shown that the care financed by the German Government to date is insufficient" and that "it is imperative to expand these assistance measures quickly given the advanced age of many of the affected persons";

Whereas German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer acknowledged, in 1951, the responsibility of Germany to provide moral and financial compensation to Holocaust victims worldwide;

Whereas every successive German Chancellor has reaffirmed that acknowledgment, including Chancellor Angela Merkel, who, in 2007, reaffirmed that "only by fully accepting its enduring responsibility for this most appalling period and for the cruelest crimes in its history, can Germany shape the future";

Whereas, in 2015, the spokesperson of Chancellor Angela Merkel confirmed that "all Germans know the history of the murderous race mania of the Nazis that led to the break with civilization that was the Holocaust . . . we know the responsibility for this crime against humanity is German and very much our own"; and

Whereas Congress believes it is the moral and historical responsibility of Germany to comprehensively, permanently, and urgently provide resources for the medical, mental health, and long-term care needs of all Holocaust victims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) acknowledges the financial and moral commitment of the Federal Republic of Germany over the past seven decades to provide a measure of justice for Holocaust victims; and

(2) supports the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims in the United States and around the world are able to live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start by thanking Senator NELSON for advancing this

measure through the other body. I would also like to recognize the good work of Chairman Emeritus ROS-LEHTINEN as well as Congressman DEUTCH for their companion resolution which passed this body in June with the unanimous support of our colleagues.

The horrors wrought by the Nazi regime did not end when the prisoners finally walked out from behind the barbed wire fences in 1945. The aftereffects of Hitler's death camps still haunt the lives of those who remain.

Tens of thousands of Holocaust survivors throughout the world live in poverty. The problem is staggering. There are 195,000 survivors and their families, according to the Registry of Holocaust Survivors, that remain. Most of those survivors, original survivors, are in their eighties today. The world loses 1,000 of those survivors every month.

But today, more than one in four lack sufficient access to or funds for necessary medical, home care, mental health care, medicine, and transportation—essential tools which would allow them to live their final years in comfort and in dignity.

For decades, Germany has instituted and funded a number of aid programs in recognition of its moral obligation to guarantee for those survivors—to guarantee—a chance at such a life. However, as they age, Holocaust victims' health and assistance needs—already more demanding than those of their peers—evolve and intensify. German evaluations of government programs this year exposed gaps in home care, in mental health programs, and in long-term medical care, and this must be remedied.

Chancellor Merkel has acknowledged Germany's responsibility to those who survived Hitler's terror. The government has also affirmed that more must be done. A high-level working group was recently established to develop proposals for more extensive assistance for home care and for social welfare needs, but the negotiations for these changes, these program changes, under German law have stalled.

Time is of the essence. Every day that decisions are stalled, we lose another survivor, we lose another story, and we lose another chance to show our respect for those individuals who have already endured what no one should. That is why our ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL, and I are supportive of this measure and would urge all Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I want to thank the chairman, as always, for being so cooperative and important in passing this legislation. I want to thank my friends from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. DEUTCH,

who introduced the House companion to this resolution, which I was proud to cosponsor and which passed the House in June.

Mr. Speaker, there are roughly a half million survivors of the Holocaust alive today—many people think it is not much, but it is, a half million—all over the world. Many of these men and women are now reaching their eighties and nineties, and some even older.

These individuals, of course, lived through the darkest chapter in human history. They endured unspeakable horrors, and many still suffer the physical and emotional trauma stemming from that experience. So it is absolutely tragic that so many survivors today are forced to live in poverty with inadequate health care, food, and access to transportation. It is unconscionable that, at the end of their lives, these people find themselves without adequate support.

Now, the Government of Germany accepts responsibility to support these survivors and, over the decades, has done a great deal, but even their officials acknowledge that more needs to be done. This resolution calls on the authorities in Germany to make sure every Holocaust survivor has the support and resources they need to live in dignity.

We know it is never easy for a government to dig deeper, but in the case of this generation of survivors, there should not be any question that they should be able to live out their lives without worrying over how to pay the medical bills or the grocery bills. It is important that we do this. I am glad to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, our wonderful chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the time, and I thank the ranking member as well. What a joy it has been to work with my Florida colleague, TED DEUTCH, on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a concurrent resolution introduced by our wonderful Florida Senator, BILL NELSON. This measure follows a similar bipartisan resolution that my south Florida friend, TED DEUTCH, and I introduced earlier this year, which this body passed unanimously in June. The vote was 363-0.

I want to thank Senator NELSON as well as Senator COLLINS for taking the lead on this initiative in the Senate and for the Senate taking action, passing this important resolution, and bringing it back to us. I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their support on this measure and helping it get to the floor today.

This bipartisan resolution, Mr. Speaker, is simple, but it is so impor-

tant. It calls on Germany to honor its moral and historical obligations to all Holocaust survivors and to provide for their unmet needs immediately and comprehensively. That is something that is going to happen thanks to all of the good men and women here.

For TED, for Senator NELSON, and for me, this issue hits very close to home, Mr. Speaker. As Members of Congress from the State of Florida, we represent thousands of Holocaust survivors. Some 15,000 are estimated to be living in south Florida alone.

But it hits even closer to home today. Why? Because, when I spoke on this floor in June in support of the version that Mr. DEUTCH and I introduced in the House, I mentioned several of the Holocaust survivors whom TED and I have been honored to call our dear friends. Among them was a remarkable and incomparable gentleman named Jack Rubin. Sadly, Jack passed away July 11, at the age of 88.

□ 1445

Jack and his two sisters survived the unimaginable, Mr. Speaker—the atrocities of humanity's darkest period. Jack managed to survive the nightmares of Auschwitz and three other death camps, four in total, until he was, as he testified in Congress in 2008, "liberated on May 1, 1945, from hell, by the U.S. Army."

Once Jack came to the United States, he served in the U.S. Army. That is how much he loved his new country.

For all that Jack had witnessed, for all that Jack had lived through, somehow he drew strength from his trials and tribulations and became a leading force in the fight for justice and dignity for all Holocaust survivors. And on this issue that we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, Jack was an unwavering voice and a force for justice. He led the call for Germany to honor its commitments to provide for all of the survivors' medical, mental, and home care needs.

Thankfully, Jack lived to see the House pass our resolution. He even lived to see the Claims Conference in Germany announce an alleged major expansion in home care for Holocaust survivors.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that if Jack were here today, he would say: But we must do more.

You see, as part of the heralded announcement by the Claims Conference in Germany, Germany was supposed to lift the home care caps for all concentration camp and ghetto survivors.

Yet, the sad truth is, Mr. Speaker, according to the reports that we have seen, this claim is just not true, and many survivors are still subjected to arbitrary caps on home care hours, some even having their weekly hours reduced.

What has happened?

To make matters worse, the Claims Conference in Germany's recent negotiations did not even address the horrendous shortfalls in funding for emergency services such as medicine, medical care, dental care, hearing aids, and other vital services for survivors. This omission is inexcusable, Mr. Speaker. It will cause further needless suffering and deaths among survivors in need of help.

Germany has an obligation to do better than that, and I am optimistic that it will. We have an obligation to Holocaust survivors to do better to ensure that they live out their days in the dignity and comfort that they deserve.

What does this mean, Mr. Speaker?

It means full funding for all health and welfare needs for all survivors. That is why this resolution before us today is so timely and so important.

My friend, Jack Rubin—and I know that he was Mr. DEUTCH's friend as well—dedicated his life to justice for all Holocaust survivors. It is up to us to keep fighting for all the Jack Rubins of the world to continue Jack's legacy until justice is finally won. I will keep fighting for Jack's legacy and for all survivors.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and to support this resolution. We must urge our German friends to do more, to do the right thing for all Holocaust survivors. Passing this resolution will send a strong message that we believe the job is not yet done and that more must be done.

Those of us—like Mr. DEUTCH, like Mr. ROYCE, and like Mr. ENGEL—who have been in the forefront—Senators NELSON and COLLINS—of the fight for Holocaust survivors' rights, needs, and interests are grateful for the unanimous support of our colleagues in the House and in the Senate for these resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, it has been over 70 years since humanity's darkest period, yet many survivors today still face lingering injustices of the Holocaust. We have had opportunities to address these injustices and, indeed, we have had an obligation to address them and to try to fix the wrongs of the past.

Germany has acknowledged its responsibility and its obligations to Holocaust survivors. Congress has acknowledged that we have a moral obligation to survivors—many of whom are American citizens, many of whom are our constituents, and many of whom live today at or below the poverty line.

We must acknowledge that too many Holocaust survivors are forced, even today, over 70 years later, to continue to suffer the injustices of the past and the indifference of the present. But for the survivors who remain and for all whom we have lost, we must—and we are here today—take a stand. We hope Chancellor Merkel of Germany and the German Government will hear our pleas for action and take them to heart so that the remaining survivors may live out their lives in the comfort and the dignity that they deserve.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would say that if we are going to stand for justice for all survivors, then we must also acknowledge the other still unresolved injustices being inflicted on Holocaust survivors in our time—specifically, the act of being denied their day in court. It is simply unconscionable that insurance companies such as Allianz and Generali have managed to dishonor tens of thousands of insurance policies they sold to Jews in Europe before the Holocaust, and continue to deny Holocaust survivors and their families these paid-for obligations. To this day, they refuse to acknowledge this.

The obligations of the insurers are moral and financial. I believe it is imperative that this Congress rectify the unfortunate reality that makes Holocaust survivors second-class citizens by denying them access to U.S. courts to attempt to reclaim these family legacies.

It is quite simply a right they have been denied far too long. We cannot bring them back, we cannot correct the problems that happened in the past, but we can correct them now, Mr. Speaker. We can correct them for the heirs who deserve justice. It is within our power to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues in Congress for supporting this resolution. I thank them for lending their voices to the cause of justice for all Holocaust survivors. This is just one step—it is an important step—in the long road to justice. I implore my friends and colleagues to continue to do more in support for all Holocaust survivors.

I thank my good friend, the chairman of our committee, for this time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to first congratulate my colleague from south Florida for her outstanding statement and her outstanding work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and an author of the House companion to this resolution.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends, Ranking Member ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE, for their efforts. A sincere thanks to my dear friend, Chairman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her partnership on this effort, her unyielding commitment to seeing that there is justice. She has been a tireless advocate for Holocaust survivors and the entire community. I also want to thank our Florida colleague, Senator BILL NELSON, and Senator COLLINS, for spearheading this effort in the Senate. We share a deep commitment to ensuring that every survivor can live out his or her life with dignity. It is a commitment that was inspired each and every day by those in our own communities. But for me, especially, it was a commitment inspired every day by our great friend and Holocaust survivor, my constituent, Jack Rubin.

Jack survived Auschwitz and three other death camps before he was liberated at age 16. He was the only member of his family to survive.

For decades, Jack fought for the needs of the survivor community. He fought for the right to seek justice. He was a voice for so many of those who had no one to speak for them. He traveled to Washington, D.C., many times at his own expense, well into his eighties. He testified in front of Congress. For me, Jack was a friend and a mentor. He was a cheerleader, he was an eternal optimist. He believed that it wasn't too late, it was never too late, to make a real difference in the lives of those who had suffered history's greatest tragedy.

When the House version of this resolution passed back in June, Jack was watching from his home in Boynton Beach, Florida. When I returned to my office from speaking on the floor, I had a message from Jack telling me that he had tears in his eyes as he watched the House vote and that it was the best birthday present he could have asked for.

Jack Rubin passed away in July, just days before the Senate passed this resolution. His wife, Shirley, his children, and especially his grandchildren, understood the commitment that he made throughout his lifetime to help those in need, especially in the survivor community. And while significant progress has been made on survivor care, Jack did not, unfortunately, live to see the day when every Holocaust survivor has his or her medical and mental health care needs met. So we continue this fight. We will press on, and passing this resolution today is the first step in continuing the legacy of my friend, Jack Rubin.

When the House passed a version of this resolution in June, we were awaiting the results of a special round of negotiations between the German Government and the Claims Conference. In December 2015, the Government of Germany acknowledged the significant gap in funding for survivor care. As a result, Germany agreed to a new, high-level working group that would conduct additional negotiations aimed to close the gap for funding of home care needs.

In an effort to make clear the severity of the needs and the critical importance of these negotiations, Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and I introduced the House companion to this resolution. The introduction and passage of that resolution, which urged the German Government to fulfill its moral and financial obligations to victims of the Holocaust, sent a very clear message to our German friends that the U.S. Congress was watching these negotiations. As we watched, a significant increase in home care funding was announced for 2016 and 2017, and a new agreement reached for 2018. Arbitrary caps placed on the number of home care hours allowed were also lifted. This is a commendable step forward, but there are still so many unmet needs.

I am deeply appreciative of the decades-long commitment of the German Government to caring for survivors. I

have spoken directly to Chancellor Merkel about this commitment, and I know that it is personal for her. I want our German friends to understand that this isn't about getting to a specific dollar figure. This is about continuing to meet all needs for a very small, very fragile part of the population that is rapidly aging.

This is the last chance to make sure that those who suffered through the most horrific crimes against humanity are cared for. Survivors are in their eighties, nineties, and into their one hundreds. There is a finite amount of time left. This is not an indefinite commitment on the part of Germany.

The resolution before us today continues to support the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims in the United States and around the world are able to live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years.

No amount of money can ever erase the tragedies of the past. No amount of money is ever a substitute for justice. But the day-to-day suffering of this very vulnerable population can be eased. The needs of elderly survivors are exacerbated by their physical and mental experiences during the Holocaust. Leaving their own homes for institutionalized care is often not an option. The tragic loss of many family members at the hands of Nazis means that many survivors rely on social services for meal deliveries or rides to doctor appointments. These are the most basic of human needs, and they deserve to have them met.

I want to thank my friend, Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN, and I want to thank Ranking Member ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE for their support, and Senator NELSON and Senator COLLINS for their efforts in the Senate.

I want to urge my colleagues to join us in urging Germany to ensure basic dignity and comfort for survivors.

When you look into the eyes of survivors in my district, as I do quite often, they worry about others. They say: Never again.

But we should worry about them. For their remaining time on this Earth, they deserve peace through living out their lives with dignity. Germany can help make sure that they do. Jack Rubin knew and fought for that literally until his last breath, and this resolution commits Congress to that fight for dignity.

□ 1500

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Our colleagues have been very eloquent this afternoon, and I agree with everything that has been said here, along with what the chairman has said.

Mr. Speaker, every year we lose more and more of those who lived through the Holocaust, and it is unthinkable that many spend their last days in poverty with no support network. Nobody wants that.

With this resolution, we are simply saying that this should not be the case.

We are saying that these survivors should never go without assistance and resources and that it is time for the Government of Germany to work with its partners and correct this problem.

So for all the reasons that were mentioned, I support this measure. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

So I think, for the Members here, we all understand that we have to commit to do all we can to honor and to support those survivors who are still with us. Their stories serve as testaments to the consequences of doing nothing in the face of evil.

Within these victims' lifetimes, we have already seen the minimization and the outright denial of the nightmares visited personally upon them during the Holocaust. We have already seen those who deny the existence of the Holocaust, as Iran did in May of this year again when it hosted yet another denial of the Holocaust and Holocaust cartoon contest.

We owe it to those who suffered through Hitler's genocide to empower them to live the remainder of their lives in dignity and to hold to Elie Wiesel's pledge: that we shall never forget.

I urge every Member's support for this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 46.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR A NEW MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 729) expressing support for the expeditious consideration and finalization of a new, robust, and long-term Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance to Israel between the United States Government and the Government of Israel.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 729

Whereas in April 1998 the United States designated Israel as a "major non-NATO ally";

Whereas, on August 16, 2007, the United States and Israel signed a 10-year Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on United States military assistance to Israel, the total assistance over the course of this understanding would equal \$30,000,000,000;

Whereas since the signing of the 2007 Memorandum of Understanding, intelligence and defense cooperation has continued to grow;

Whereas, on October 15, 2008, the Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2008 was signed into law (Public Law 110-429) and defined Israel's qualitative military edge (QME) as "the ability to counter and defeat any credible conventional military threat from any individual state or possible coalition of states or from non-state actors, while sustaining minimal damage and casualties, through the use of superior military means, possessed in sufficient quantity, including weapons, command, control, communication, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities that in their technical characteristics are superior in capability to those of such other individual or possible coalition of states or non-state actors";

Whereas, on July 27, 2012, the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-150) declared it to be the policy of the United States "to help the Government of Israel preserve its qualitative military edge amid rapid and uncertain regional political transformation";

Whereas Israel faces immediate threats to its security from the United States designated Foreign Terrorist Organization, Hezbollah, and its missile and rocket stockpile estimated to number around 150,000, and from the United States designated Foreign Terrorist Organization, Hamas, that continues to attempt to rebuild its tunnel network to infiltrate Israel and restock its own missile and rocket stockpiles;

Whereas Israel also faces immediate threats to its security from the ongoing regional instability in the Middle East, especially from the ongoing conflict in Syria and from militant groups in the Sinai;

Whereas Iran remains a threat to Israel, as demonstrated by Iran's continued bellicosity, including several illegal tests of ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, even reportedly marking several of these weapons with Hebrew words declaring "Israel must be wiped out";

Whereas the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 authorized funds to be appropriated for Israeli cooperative missile defense program codevelopment and coproduction, including funds to be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the David's Sling weapon system as well as the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program; and

Whereas, on December 19, 2014, the President signed into law the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-296) which stated the sense of Congress that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States and declared it to be the policy of the United States "to continue to provide Israel with robust security assistance, including for the procurement of the Iron Dome Missile Defense System": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States;

(2) reaffirms that it is the policy and law of the United States to ensure that Israel maintains its qualitative military edge and has the capacity and capability to defend itself from all threats;

(3) reaffirms United States support of a robust Israeli tiered missile defense program;

(4) supports continued discussions between the Government of the United States and the Government of Israel for a robust and long-term Memorandum of Understanding on United States military assistance to Israel;

(5) urges the expeditious finalization of a new Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of the United States and the Government of Israel; and

(6) supports a robust and long-term Memorandum of Understanding negotiated between the United States and Israel regarding military assistance which increases the amount of aid from previous agreements and significantly enhances Israel's military capabilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friends, the gentlewoman and gentleman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. DEUTCH, who are chair and ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, for their hard work and leadership in bringing this important measure to the floor today. And I also thank the ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL from New York, for his work on the resolution as well.

Israel is one of America's closest friends, and Israel is facing growing threats. Today Iran's leading terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, has thousands of missiles and rockets and mortars that are aimed at Israel—over 100,000. And the threat from Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps is even worse, as we hear from those chants: "Death to Israel."

The United States must stand with Israel to help promote security and stability in the volatile Middle East. And next year, the current memorandum of understanding signed with Israel in 2007 that guaranteed Israel \$3.1 billion per year in foreign military financing will expire.

The administration and Israel are currently negotiating the terms of a new package for the next 10 years, ensuring that Israel will maintain its qualitative military edge in the region. That is the goal of Mr. ELIOT ENGEL. That is my goal. That is the goal of our subcommittee chairman and ranking member.

This new agreement will guide our security cooperation: from Iron Dome and David's Sling, defending Israel from the air, to cooperative initiatives aimed at tunnel detection, defending Israel from below.

This relationship has real benefits for the United States. The two countries

share intelligence on terrorism, on nuclear proliferation, on regional instability. Israel's military experiences have shaped the United States' approach to counterterrorism and our approach to homeland security. The two governments work together to develop sophisticated military technology for defense, such as the missile and subterranean detection systems that I have mentioned. These systems developed jointly may soon be ready for export to other U.S. allies.

In part because of this security partnership, U.S. and Israeli companies partner in technological innovations that are helping the United States maintain its advantage in a range of military and nonmilitary security challenges.

So I urge my colleagues to strongly support this resolution, urging the expeditious finalization of a new memorandum of understanding between the Government of the United States and the Government of Israel so that Israel maintains its qualitative military edge and has the capacity to work with us to defend itself from all threats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I am proud to cosponsor this resolution, which calls for the expeditious consideration and finalization of a new, robust, and long-term memorandum of understanding on military assistance to Israel. The bond between United States and Israel is unbreakable. We share common values and goals, including democracy, rule of law, minority rights, and basic human freedom.

In 2008, the George W. Bush administration negotiated a memorandum of understanding with Israel that guaranteed \$3.1 billion in annual security assistance. Since then, the Obama administration has delivered on this commitment and has provided additional funds for missile defense, including the 2014 emergency supplemental for Iron Dome, which we passed in this House.

Since that agreement, Israel has faced some of the most urgent threats in history: rockets and tunnels from Gaza and Lebanon, nuclear threats from Syria and Iran, and the spread of ISIS throughout the region. And the United States has been there by Israel's side throughout this dangerous time.

These threats are only becoming more complex. ISIS has grown in the Sinai. Israel's neighbors are facing new burdens from refugees, leading to instability. And Iran's behavior in the region has, unfortunately, become even more dangerous.

So yesterday's insurance policy has become today's lifeline. As Israel confronts new threats, the United States must step up to defend our ally. Part of this will be through a new, negotiated MOU, or memorandum of understanding, to reflect the changing times and evolving threats in the Middle East.

Israel will need its American partner; but, make no mistake, the United States needs Israel as well. This relationship isn't a one-way street. Our security cooperation and intelligence sharing with Israel has never been closer. Israel helps develop new technology that the United States uses in our own security efforts. And the military hardware we are providing to help Israel defend itself will be spent here in the United States, saving or creating thousands of American jobs.

This resolution and its robust support here in the House, in both parties, demonstrates the true nature of the relationship between the United States and Israel. The support is bipartisan. Neither Democrats nor Republicans have a monopoly on support for Israel. Democrats and Republicans stand together, united with Israel. The American people stand with Israel.

The next MOU will be the next chapter in this friendship. It shows that no matter who the next President will be, Israel has America's promise of support. As Israel faces uncertainties throughout its region, at least it can count on American support, and Congress should work to make that happen. Israel has never asked for American troops or soldiers or for anyone to defend them except themselves, and we ought to continue to help them do that.

I ask all Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and is the author of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of our wonderful committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize enough just how important it is that the United States and Israel finalize a new, long-term, and robust memorandum of understanding on U.S. military assistance to Israel. And an overwhelming majority of our colleagues in Congress agree.

This bipartisan resolution, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 729, that I introduced alongside my friend and colleague, the gentleman from south Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the ranking member of our Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, has over 275 cosponsors. This is the kind of support we don't see very often, but it underscores the level of commitment and support that the United States Congress has for our closest friend and ally, the democratic, Jewish State of Israel.

It is absolutely imperative, Mr. Speaker, that the administration finalize and sign a new memorandum of understanding with Israel as soon as possible because the threats to Israel aren't going away anytime soon.

Just last week, it was reported that the Israeli military had assessed that

it expects ISIS attacks on its southern border within 6 months. This is extremely alarming and, if true, all the more reason to finalize a new MOU with Israel.

We know that Egypt has been fighting ISIS in the Sinai for quite some time now; but if ISIS is able to continue moving north toward Israel, it would leave Israel vulnerable on almost every border, except the border that it shares with Jordan, where the King and the Jordanians have been so important in the fight against ISIS.

As if the thought of ISIS surrounding the Jewish state was not daunting enough, as a result of the Iran nuclear deal, the threats to Israel have only increased in magnitude and severity. Iran has shown that it has no intention of slowing down its ballistic missile program, which it uses to repeatedly threaten Israel. We have recently learned that the nuclear deal is full of secret concessions and exemptions to Iran which allow Iran to exceed limits that are set forth in the deal. And these are just the ones that we know of now. There are likely a lot more.

We just heard testimony last week that the administration may have sent Iran up to \$33.6 billion in cash payments, including \$1.7 billion in ransom payments. Administration officials have said that there is no way of tracing the money or of telling if that money will be used to support terror; but Iran had said that it needed hard currency, so we sent it because that is a great idea: to give a state sponsor of terror an infusion of billions of dollars of cold, hard cash. That makes a lot of sense.

So now Iran has as much as \$33.6 billion in cash; and, no doubt, it will be used to support terror. There is no doubt. It will be used to shore up Hezbollah's weapons supply. It will be used to increase the missile stockpile of Hezbollah. It will be used for many nefarious activities. And with Iran's stated intention to wipe Israel off the map, there should be no time wasted in ensuring that the Jewish state has the capability, has the capacity to defend itself and her people from every threat.

With all of the concessions that the administration has made to Iran, we need to make sure that this memorandum of understanding goes above and beyond.

As my former chief of staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Dr. Yleem Poblete, wrote in a piece for the Gatestone Institute a couple of months ago:

"The terms of any U.S.-Israel agreement must withstand comparison to the concessions offered Iran in the JCPOA and show unequivocally that Israel, a trusted ally and major strategic partner, fared better in negotiations than an unconstrained enemy."

This is why the administration must conclude this MOU with Israel. It would send a strong message to the people of Israel that the United States continues to stand by them and sup-

port them. But, Mr. Speaker, it would send an even stronger message to those who seek to harm Israel by signifying that the United States is committing to fully support Israel's defense and security needs.

So I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I call upon the administration to put the politicking aside, get this agreement done, secure Israel's safety and our own interests.

We are going to hear a lot of support for this resolution. We have heard about the many threats facing Israel.

□ 1515

And I spoke about the nuclear threat and how it has placed Israel in greater jeopardy. But what we don't hear too much about, Mr. Speaker, is how the nuclear deal has threatened Israel's qualitative military edge, the QME, that, by U.S. law, we are supposed to ensure.

When the administration signed that weak and dangerous nuclear deal with Iran, it had to sell it to the international community. How did it do that? Well, in order to sell the deal to our allies in the Gulf, the administration had to promise them that we would provide them with advanced weapon sales.

The administration likes to say that the Iran deal will make the world safer. But if that is true, then why are we going to increase so much the militarization of the Gulf countries?

Mr. Speaker, I expect that Gulf states sales of military jets to Bahrain, to Qatar, and to Kuwait will be approved by the administration as early as this month. We are about to open the spigot of cash that Iran can then use to build up its ballistic missiles, its military, and its terror activities. So we need to make sure that Israel understands that we are there to support her.

It makes no sense, Mr. Speaker, that we should be concentrating on stopping Iran, not assisting the regime, to further carrying out its nefarious activities and certainly not helping to build up its conventional nuclear arms race in the region. Not to mention that by doing this we are undermining the distinct advantage that Israel has militarily over its neighbors.

Even though Israel and our other partners in the region may have better relations now than ever before—and that is true, and that is wonderful—because they have an Iran, a mutual enemy that they understand is their greatest threat, history tells that it is better to be safe than sorry. So that is another important reason why we need to conclude this MOU with the Jewish state and ensure its qualitative military edge.

We have an ever increasingly dangerous Iran, a heavily militarized Middle East with advanced weaponry, ISIS becoming an even greater threat to Israel, Hezbollah on the Golan Heights and in Lebanon, and, of course, Hamas in Gaza. That is a daunting task to ask

of even the largest country, Mr. Speaker, let alone the tiny Jewish state.

So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I urge them to call upon the administration to uphold longstanding U.S. policy toward our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish state of Israel.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), an author of this resolution and a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member ENGEL for his support of this resolution and his outspoken and unwavering support for the U.S.-Israel relationship. I also thank Chairman ROYCE for his support of this as well. And to my friend and partner, Representative ROS-LEHTINEN, I thank her as well. It is wonderful working with her on so many issues, but in particular our work on the committee to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship. Thanks as well to Representatives GRANGER and LOWEY for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that the United States and Israel are very close to signing a new memorandum of understanding, a 10-year MOU on security systems.

This resolution before us today is very straightforward. It urges the conclusion of those negotiations. It doesn't prescribe terms of the MOU. It says that we need to get the MOU finished. This resolution has the overwhelming bipartisan support of over 275 Members of this House who are co-sponsors.

Now, the MOU is the backbone of our security relationship with Israel. The assistance provided has ensured and will continue to ensure that Israel is able to defend herself against any and all threats.

The threats that Israel faces increase every day. Every day the threat of rocket attacks from Hamas, Islamic Jihad, or Hezbollah looms. Every day Hezbollah adds more advanced rockets to its arsenal of over 150,000 capable of reaching every corner of Israel. Every day Iran transfers advanced technology and weapons to its terror proxies who target Israel. And every day Hamas is attempting to re-dig tunnels farther and farther into Israel.

ISIS militants edge closer to Israel's border in the Sinai, and the fighting in Syria creeps closer and closer into the Golan Heights. Terrorist groups now have unprecedented, sophisticated capabilities, and many of these pose a strategic threat to the broader region.

Mr. Speaker, Israel must have the resources that it needs to protect the safety and security of its territory and its people and, in turn, to preserve our own security and interests in the region.

Throughout these negotiations, the administration has said that it is prepared to conclude the largest ever aid package to Israel. Now, these funds, coupled with our enduring commitment to preserving Israel's qualitative

military edge, will help Israel remain strong and secure. And as the only democracy in the region, Israel stands as a beacon of hope for those around the world who recognize the global threat of terrorism and for those who value opportunity, equality, and freedom.

When this Congress speaks with one voice, Israel is stronger and safer. By passing this resolution, this Congress is sending a message to the world that we stand united in support of a new MOU, in support of Israel's right to self-defense, and in strong support of the U.S.-Israel relationship.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague. I stand in support of Representative ROS-LEHTINEN's H. Res. 729.

It is imperative that the United States finalize a new MOU with Israel on military assistance that provides for a robust defense posture of Israel while ensuring congressional oversight and scrutiny in the years to come.

Israel continues to face a growing threat from not only state sponsors of terrorism like Iran, but also from terrorist organizations like Hezbollah and Hamas. Both Iran and those terrorist organizations are determined to destroy Israel.

Israel, one of the United States' greatest allies in the region, is under constant threat; and the United States must stand strong and support her.

Hezbollah has an estimated stockpile of 150,000 rockets and missiles. Let me repeat that. It has over 150,000 rockets and missiles, which Iran has made a commitment to add smart bomb technology. This constant threat is growing and needs to be countered by the passage of a robust, long-term MOU. This will ensure Israel's defense and military capabilities are able to meet these growing threats.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 729 and support the continued defense cooperation with Israel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there are any more speakers on the Republican side?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, there are no further speakers other than myself to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the sponsors of this resolution, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. DEUTCH, for their hard work in crafting such a timely resolution. I thank, once again, Chairman ROYCE for working with me and the sponsors of this resolution to move this forward expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I always say is that the relationship between the United States and Israel is bigger than any of the personalities involved. Presidents come and go, Prime Ministers come and go, Members of

Congress come and go, members of the Knesset come and go, but the relationship between the U.S. and Israel endures and endures strongly.

The success of the last MOU between the United States and Israel is a great illustration of that fact. I think this resolution and the next memorandum of understanding, which we are expecting any day now, are more indications that, regardless of party, regardless of personalities, the U.S.-Israel alliance is serious business and a major foreign policy concern.

Those that try to denigrate Israel overlook the fact that Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and overlook the fact that we have no better ally in the United States than the people of Israel.

I am glad to support this measure. I urge all Members to do the same. Again, the U.S.-Israel alliance is serious business, a major foreign policy concern, and the right thing to do, not only for Israel but for the United States as well. So I support this measure, and I urge all our colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as this resolution notes, Israel faces a growing number of threats, and I think I would just speak for a moment about the nature of those threats. I appreciate Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN bringing this resolution before us.

Representative ELIOT ENGEL and I had a rather unique opportunity of seeing how these threats keep evolving. We were near the border in Israel and had an invitation on the Gaza border to go into one of these tunnels that had been discovered. Imagine the shock when we found out the intentions of why this tunnel was dug. It ended up coming up underneath an elementary school.

Now, imagine for a minute the situation Israel is in when you have an adversary, Hamas in this case, who wishes to tunnel underneath an elementary school in order to capture children, take them back into Gaza, and force the IDF, as you and I knew they would do, to fight block by block by block to try to free those children. That was the strategy. Now, luckily the tunnels were discovered before they could carry this out.

I was in Israel also in 2006, back during the second Lebanon war. The Hezbollah rockets came down across northern Israel every day. And in Haifa, every day there were victims that were brought into that trauma hospital.

Back then, Hezbollah had a collection of about 10,000 rockets and missiles. That is what they had left in the inventory. They had shot off about half of their inventory. And in each of those, there were probably 90,000 ball bearings. And when they shot those rockets, they aimed at the city center in Haifa.

Today is 10 years later. Hezbollah, as Mr. YOHIO shared with you, has a nasty collection today of over 100,000 of these rockets and missiles. Now, if you were to take the United States out of the equation with respect to NATO, and you were to take a look at the NATO arsenal without us in it, Hezbollah, which is now equipped by Iran, has a larger number of weapons, rockets and missiles, than all of NATO combined without us.

Included in that class are 700 long-range, high-payload rockets that have now been provided to Hezbollah, and these new rockets that carry these huge payloads are capable of taking out a city block and just creating havoc.

And while the threat from Hezbollah is bad, let's talk about the threat from its sponsor for a minute. Let's reflect on the threat from Iran itself. If you wonder whether Iran intends what they say, think about their continued aggression in the region, and think about their testing of ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

In case there is any mistake about how we might interpret it, they put on the side of these missiles, in Arabic, in Farsi, and in Hebrew, the words, "Israel must be wiped out." That is the action of the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps. That is what it puts on its missiles.

Of course, under the administration's Iran deal, Tehran will keep much of its nuclear infrastructure and continue to develop advanced centrifuges faster and faster. They can continue to work on this, thus gaining the ability to produce nuclear fuel on an industrial scale. The ayatollah won't even have to cheat to be just steps away from a nuclear weapon 10 years from now when that agreement is phased out and expires. And that is about the same time that the next MOU will expire.

So for those who are wondering why we are passionate about this memorandum of understanding with Israel, it is because we have seen the threats. Mr. ELIOT ENGEL and I, in our trips to Israel to the border, have seen those threats.

□ 1530

Given that, and given that Israel faces, not just from the proxies like Iran, not just from Hamas that are funded, but also from Iran itself Israel faces this threat, we need to ensure that the security package currently being negotiated is as robust as possible. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 729.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, AND THE RULE OF LAW IN CAMBODIA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 728) supporting human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Cambodia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 728

Whereas since the Paris Peace Accords in 1991, Cambodia has undergone a gradual, partial, and unsteady transition to democracy, including elections and multiparty government;

Whereas Prime Minister Hun Sen has been in power in Cambodia uninterrupted since 1985 and is the longest-serving leader in Southeast Asia;

Whereas Freedom House rated Cambodia as “Not Free” in its “Freedom in the World 2015” report, noting that “political opposition is restricted”, “harassment or threats against opposition supporters are not uncommon”, “freedom of speech is not fully protected”, and “the government’s tolerance for freedoms of association and assembly has declined in recent years”;

Whereas Cambodia held a general election on July 28, 2013, though widespread reports of irregularities largely related to the voter lists bring into question the integrity of the election;

Whereas a coalition of election monitors, including the National Democratic Institute (NDI), Transparency International Cambodia, and other domestic and international organizations, in a joint report on the 2013 election found “significant challenges that undermined the credibility of the process”;

Whereas Transparency International Cambodia, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, conducted a survey during the 2013 election that found at 60 percent of polling stations, citizens with proper identification were not allowed to vote;

Whereas the Cambodian National Election Committee (NEC) was accused of lack of independence and pro-government bias during its oversight of the 2013 election;

Whereas the composition of the NEC was changed after the 2013 election to include equal membership from both political parties, and the NEC’s continued independence is essential to free and fair elections;

Whereas the United States Congress has taken steps to protect democracy and human rights in Cambodia, making certain 2014 foreign aid funds intended to Cambodia conditioned upon the Government of Cambodia conducting an independent and credible investigation into the irregularities associated with the July 28, 2013, parliamentary elections and reforming the NEC or when all parties have agreed to join the National Assembly to conduct business;

Whereas United States aid to Cambodia has funded work in areas including development assistance, civil society, global health, and the Khmer Rouge Tribunal, largely via nongovernmental organizations (NGOs);

Whereas both NDI and the International Republican Institute (IRI) operate in Cam-

bodia, engaging local partners and building capacity for civil society, democracy, and good governance;

Whereas the Government of Cambodia has acted to restrict the right to freely assemble and protest, including the following instances;

Whereas, on January 3, 2014, Cambodian security forces violently cracked down on protests of garment workers, killing 4 people in Phnom Penh;

Whereas, on March 31, 2014, Cambodian police beat protestors with batons and clubs during a protest calling for a license for the independent Beehive Radio to establish a television channel;

Whereas in August 2015, the Government of Cambodia passed the “Law on Associations and Non-Governmental Organizations” which threatens to restrict the development of civil society by requiring registration and government approval of both domestic and international NGOs;

Whereas, on October 26, 2015, 2 opposition lawmakers, including dual United States citizen Nhay Chamroeun, were violently attacked by pro-government protestors in front of the National Assembly;

Whereas, on November 16, 2015, the standing committee of the National Assembly expelled leader of the parliamentary opposition and President of the Cambodian National Rescue Party (CNRP) Sam Rainsy and revoked his parliamentary immunity;

Whereas Mr. Rainsy is the subject of a Government of Cambodia investigation of 7-year-old defamation charges against him which is widely believed to be politically motivated;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Cambodia has publicly called on the Government of Cambodia to revoke the arrest warrant issued against Mr. Rainsy, allow all opposition lawmakers to “return to Cambodia without fear of arrest and persecution”, and “to take immediate steps to guarantee a political space free from threats or intimidation in Cambodia”;

Whereas political advocate and anti-corruption activist Kem Ley was shot and killed in Phnom Penh on July 10, 2016;

Whereas the Government of Cambodia continues efforts to prosecute CNRP leaders on politically-motivated charges, bringing Mr. Sokha’s case to trial in Phnom Penh; and

Whereas national elections in 2018 will be closely watched to ensure openness and fairness, and to monitor whether all political parties and civil society are allowed to freely participate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to promoting democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in Cambodia;

(2) condemns all forms of political violence in Cambodia and urges the cessation of ongoing human rights violations;

(3) calls on the Government of Cambodia to respect freedom of the press and the rights of its citizens to freely assemble, protest, and speak out against the government;

(4) supports electoral reform efforts in Cambodia and free and fair elections in 2018 monitored by international observers; and

(5) urges Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Cambodian People’s Party to—

(A) end all harassment and intimidation of Cambodia’s opposition;

(B) drop all politically motivated charges against opposition lawmakers;

(C) allow them to return to Cambodia and freely participate in the political process; and

(D) foster an environment where democracy can thrive and flourish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising here in strong support for H. Res. 728, supporting human rights and democracy and the rule of law in Cambodia.

We have all seen the consequences of land grabbing and the destruction of human liberty in that country. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), my colleague, for introducing this resolution. I want to thank him for his advocacy for the people of Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, since Cambodia held its deeply flawed elections in 2013, we have seen significant attacks on those Cambodians peacefully opposing their government. Hun Sen’s thuggish regime continues to crack down on the political opposition and on activists, and they continue to arrest and beat those who point out violations of freedom of speech, violations, frankly, of a stolen election.

As noted in this resolution, Freedom House’s most recent report card rated Cambodia as not free, noting restrictions on and the harassment of the government’s political opposition. And that is putting it mildly. Last year opposition lawmaker and American citizen Nhay Chamroeun was severely and brutally attacked by plainclothes bodyguards who repeatedly kicked and stomped him. He was hospitalized for months.

We have all seen the pictures of opposition figures who have been beaten and stomped and put in the hospital there. Several months later, Kem Ley, a popular Cambodian political commentator, was murdered in broad daylight for his outspoken protest of the regime. So much for freedom of speech in Cambodia.

Then just last week, Hun Sen took yet another step to consolidate his grip on power, to make it impossible for people to run against him. He sentenced the de facto leader of the Cambodia National Rescue Party, Kem Sokha, to 5 months in prison on the spurious charge of refusing to appear for questioning in a politically motivated case that was brought against him. Although his sentence is short, the repercussions are dire, as convicted criminals are prohibited from holding office; and that, again, was what this was about: intimidation and trying to

force a system where the opposition party leader already in exile would then be in a position where they couldn't run somebody against Hun Sen.

Mr. Speaker, these attacks on the opposition must stop. This systemic persecution of the government's opposition completely undermines the legitimacy of upcoming local elections as well as the country's 2018 national elections.

Without the full and free participation of the CNRP, future elections will be deeply flawed and cannot be accepted. Hun Sen's continued attack on his political opponents is something we cannot accept, and for the sake of the Cambodian people, I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also rise in support of this resolution.

Let me, first of all, thank Mr. LOWENTHAL, a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his hard work on this measure; and let me just thank the chairman of the committee, as well, for always cooperating with us on bipartisan resolutions and things that are for the good of the country. That is the way we try to conduct ourselves here.

Mr. Speaker, for the last three decades, the people of Cambodia have hoped to see their country move toward a freer, more democratic system, but that progress has been halting and the results are incomplete. Hun Sen, that country's Prime Minister, has held on to power since 1985, making him currently the longest serving leader in Southeast Asia. Though elections are scheduled for 2018, it seems likely that the opposition party will endure the same sort of intimidation and harassment that it has for years.

This lack of progress and accountability on the part of the Hun Sen government has meant that Cambodia remains one of the poorest and most corrupt countries in the region. Cambodia leans on China for imports and economic assistance and has adopted some of China's most draconian laws and practices as well.

Despite these obstacles, the people of Cambodia remain remarkably resilient and entrepreneurial. For years the United States has provided development assistance to improve Cambodian human rights protections, bolster civil society, and improve health, education, and opportunity. These investments are paying dividends in the form of a new generation of bright, thoughtful Cambodian leaders who seek more for themselves and their fellow citizens. These young leaders, along with many reformers and activists, deserve to have their voices heard.

I have been to Cambodia a few times, and it is especially poignant when you think of the terrible events, the killings there decades ago—practically

genocide—it is just intolerable, unthinkable, and unacceptable that Cambodia would still have these difficulties with all the things that the people of Cambodia have suffered.

This resolution calls on the Government of Cambodia to push ahead with real and meaningful reform that will advance democracy. It calls for changes to the electoral system that would allow for truly free and fair elections. It calls on the Hun Sen government to act now so that the 2018 elections are transparent and credible, and it calls for the end of politically motivated harassment and violence against the people of Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Cambodia want and deserve real democracy for their country. They want to chart the course for their own future and live the lives they choose for themselves. This measure sends a strong message that the United States stands with them and wants to see them realize the democratic aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), a valued member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and the author of this resolution.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member ENGEL for yielding.

First, I want to acknowledge the great work and the collaboration from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring this resolution to the floor today. Chairman ROYCE has long been a champion on Cambodian issues, and this resolution would not have been possible without his support.

I would also like to thank the Republican lead on this resolution, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, Chairman MATT SALMON; and also I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who joined with me in founding the Congressional Cambodia Caucus. I also, obviously, want to thank Ranking Member ENGEL for his support of the resolution.

Recently, the Cambodian Government, as has been pointed out, presided over by Prime Minister Hun Sen for the past 31 years, has severely cracked down on political opposition and all forms of dissent in Cambodia.

As we know, national elections in Cambodia in 2013 prolonged Hun Sen's grip on power, but they were marred by allegations of voting irregularities. After the election, Hun Sen's party and the opposition party agreed to a series of electoral reforms and power-sharing compromises.

However, since that time, the Cambodian Government has undertaken a comprehensive campaign to undermine the political opposition. Last year, the Cambodian Government revived a 7-year-old defamation charge against the

opposition leader, Mr. Sam Rainsy, expelling him from the Parliament and forcing him into self-imposed exile.

The deputy leader, Kem Sokha, who is acting as the opposition's leader, has been under effective house arrest at the party's headquarters in Phnom Penh, where he was facing charges that are similarly politically motivated, and recently he was convicted in court and is now serving time in jail.

When I spoke to the deputy leader, he told me that he not only fears this arrest by the government, which has just taken place, but he truly fears for his life. And his fears are well founded. In July, as was pointed out, prominent political activist and outspoken critic of the government Kem Ley was brutally murdered in broad daylight in Phnom Penh.

The passage of this resolution could not come at a more urgent time. The Cambodian Government has renewed its efforts to seek out, to harass, and to intimidate the leaders of the opposition. As I pointed out, last week Kem Sokha was tried and sentenced to 5 months in jail. In the lead-up to the trial, the government deployed security forces in the vicinity of the opposition party's headquarters.

Hun Sen's strategy could not be more clear: intimidate and threaten arrest to silence the opposition in advance of local elections next year and national elections the following year.

As long as these politically motivated charges remain outstanding, the current political climate in Cambodia is not one that will allow for free and fair elections. That is why it is so important for us to pass this resolution and show that the United States stands with the people of Cambodia. We will send an important signal to the Cambodian Government that political violence of any kind will not be tolerated and that the Cambodian people must be able to enjoy the freedom to choose their own leaders. Only under these conditions can elections in Cambodia be considered free and fair by the international community.

Again, I want to thank all the Members who worked so closely with me to bring this resolution to the floor. I urge passage of this resolution to send a strong message that the United States supports human rights and supports democracy and the rule of law in Cambodia.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me again repeat: we all have high hopes for the future of democracy in Cambodia. We want to see the people there exercise real rights and determine the future for their country. We know that real democracy is the key to helping countries prosper. Real democracy makes governments more transparent and accountable. When citizens are allowed to fully participate in their political systems, governments become more responsive and do a better job at providing services and opportunity; countries become better equipped as

partners on the global stage and centers of regional stability.

□ 1545

We know that Cambodia has this potential just waiting to be unleashed. So today, with this resolution, we are saying that we look forward to the day when democracy in Cambodia is allowed to flourish, and we hope that day comes soon. It is important to focus on Cambodia. We want to see that country make a change for the benefit of all its people.

So I support this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, Hun Sen and the Cambodian People's Party took yet another authoritarian step last week when they arrested and tried opposition leader Kem Sokha. In their attempts to consolidate power, they have utterly obliterated the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the long-suffering people of Cambodia deserve the opportunity to elect a government of their choosing. By attempting to disqualify and harassing all the political opposition, Hun Sen is denying the people this opportunity.

By passing this resolution, Congress is sending a message to Hun Sen that the United States is watching and will not accept his brutality. It will send an important signal of support, I believe, to all Cambodians who wish to live under a government that respects the rights of the Cambodian people.

I urge passage of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 728, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM REVIEW ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5484) to modify authorities that provide for rescission of determinations of countries as state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5484

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "State Sponsors of Terrorism Review Enhancement Act".

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS OF AUTHORITIES THAT PROVIDE FOR RESCISSION OF DETERMINATIONS OF COUNTRIES AS STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.

(a) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "45 days" and inserting "90 days"; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking "6-month period" and inserting "24-month period";

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) DISAPPROVAL OF RESCISSION.—No rescission under subsection (c)(2) of a determination under subsection (a) with respect to the government of a country may be made if the Congress, within 90 days after receipt of a report under subsection (c)(2), enacts a joint resolution described in subsection (f)(2) of section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to a rescission under subsection (f)(1) of such section of a determination under subsection (d) of such section with respect to the government of such country.";

(4) in subsection (e) (as redesignated), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "may be" and inserting "may, on a case-by-case basis, be"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) NOTIFICATION AND BRIEFING.—Not later than—

"(1) ten days after initiating a review of the activities of the government of the country concerned within the 24-month period referred to in subsection (c)(2)(A), the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of such initiation; and

"(2) 20 days after the notification described in paragraph (1), the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall brief such committees on the status of such review.";

(b) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—Section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "45 days" and inserting "90 days"; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking "6-month period" and inserting "24-month period"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "45 days" and inserting "90 days"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "45-day period" and inserting "90-day period";

(2) in subsection (g), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "may waive" and inserting "may, on a case-by-case basis, waive";

(3) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

"(l) NOTIFICATION AND BRIEFING.—Not later than—

"(1) ten days after initiating a review of the activities of the government of the country concerned within the 24-month period referred to in subsection (f)(1)(B)(i), the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of such initiation; and

"(2) 20 days after the notification described in paragraph (1), the President, acting

through the Secretary of State, shall brief such committees on the status of such review.";

(c) EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)), as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "45 days" and inserting "90 days"; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking "6-month period" and inserting "24-month period";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

"(5) DISAPPROVAL OF RESCISSION.—No rescission under paragraph (4)(B) of a determination under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to the government of a country may be made if the Congress, within 90 days after receipt of a report under paragraph (4)(B), enacts a joint resolution described in subsection (f)(2) of section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to a rescission under subsection (f)(1) of such section of a determination under subsection (d) of such section with respect to the government of such country.

"(6) NOTIFICATION AND BRIEFING.—Not later than—

"(A) ten days after initiating a review of the activities of the government of the country concerned within the 24-month period referred to in paragraph (4)(B)(i), the President, acting through the Secretary and the Secretary of State, shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of such initiation; and

"(B) 20 days after the notification described in paragraph (1), the President, acting through the Secretary and the Secretary of State, shall brief such committees on the status of such review.";

(2) REGULATIONS.—The President shall amend the Export Administration Regulations under subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, to the extent necessary and appropriate to carry out the amendment made by paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH) for his leadership in authoring this critical legislation.

The designation of a foreign government as a state sponsor of terrorism is one of our government's most powerful statements. In addition to imposing sanctions and other restrictions, the designation itself earns a state pariah status internationally, and that is deserved. After all, these are countries

whose governments back the killing of innocents as a matter of policy.

To be added to the list, the Secretary of State must determine that the government of such country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism. The designation then triggers unilateral sanctions by the United States. These sanctions include a ban on exports of weapons. It also includes limits on financing and economic assistance and restrictions on exports that can be used by that country to enhance its military capability or, of course, its ability to support terrorism.

These are important tools. They are powerful tools. Yet, under current law, to delist a state sponsor of terrorism, the administration only needs to certify that the country has refrained from supporting terrorism for a mere 6 months.

Administrations from both parties have abused this process. In 2008, North Korea's designation was rescinded following commitments it made to dismantle its nuclear weapons program. North Korea, of course, was delisted prematurely, but it kept its nuclear program, as evidenced by its fifth nuclear test last week.

Likewise, Cuba continues to harbor terrorists, both foreign and domestic terrorists. It continues to meddle in Venezuela. It continues its support for Iran's designs on Latin America. Just last month, Cuba hosted the Iranian foreign minister, as Tehran seeks to expand its presence in the hemisphere.

This legislation is an important check against administration overreach, increasing the period of time a country must refrain from supporting terrorism from 6 months to 2 years before it is eligible for being delisted. The bill also increases the period of time that Congress has to review any such proposed action by the President from 45 days to 90 days. So the bill strengthens congressional oversight of the process.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the legislation authored by Mr. TED YOHO. I think it is critical.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. YOHO of Florida for their hard work on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, there are only two ways off the State Sponsors of Terrorism list. The first is a fundamental change in the leadership and policies of a country's government. The other is if the President certifies to Congress that a government has not provided any support for international terrorism for at least 6 months, and that the country has provided assurances that it will not support international terrorism in the future. This legislation would stretch that 6-month period to 2 years. It would also double the length of time Congress has to re-

view such a certification, from 45 days to 90 days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we are going to find ourselves in a situation in which any of the countries currently on that list would need to be rushed off, particularly Syria and Iran. But our job as legislators is not just to look at what is in front of us as we draft a law, but to consider what unintended consequences we might face down the road.

As I said when we marked up this bill in June at the committee, I do think we need to carefully consider the implications of extending the waiting period so dramatically. No one wants a terrorist state to come off the list before circumstances justify, but unlikely as it may seem today, we could encounter diplomatic opportunities where the flexibility to act quickly might be in our own national security interests. We just can't envision what kind of challenges we will face years down the road.

So I support the measure, but I do have some trepidation that the 2-year waiting period could potentially hamstring our government's ability to respond strategically to rapidly changing events. I hope that, as we monitor this, Members will keep an open mind with respect to the waiting period as the legislative process goes forward. Again, I support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and Dr. YOHO for putting forth this wonderful bill. The State Sponsors of Terrorism Review Enhancement Act is the work of our Florida colleague, TED YOHO. I thank Dr. YOHO for his leadership on this bill, as well as Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership in getting it to the House floor.

This bill is an important and necessary legislative fix to a broken process: the manner in which nations are delisted as state sponsors of terrorism.

Over the years, through three different statutes, Congress developed the State Sponsors of Terrorism list and the consequences for being on the list. The three laws—the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, and the Export Administration Act—work to prevent state sponsors of terrorism from receiving assistance, goods, and technology that could help support terrorism.

In past decades, administrations from both sides of the aisle have mistakenly and prematurely delisted states, for example, including taking North Korea off the list in 2008, as the chairman pointed out, and removing Cuba, as the chairman pointed out, last year. North Korea has armed and supported organizations like Hezbollah and Hamas and has reportedly assisted

the regime in Syria and in Iran in developing their nuclear weapons program.

Other examples of North Korea's provocations and destructive behavior are prolific, including continued illegal nuclear weapons tests like the one that we just saw last week; missiles launches; cyberattacks, sinking a South Korean naval vessel; and shipping weapons systems like those that were intercepted out of Cuba in the year 2013.

Cuba has links to North Korea and state sponsors of terrorism Iran and Syria. It provides safe haven to terror groups like the Colombian FARC and Spanish ETA, and harbors fugitives, as the chairman pointed out, from American justice, like convicted cop killer JoAnne Chesimard.

As we saw in the cases of Cuba and North Korea, the process in which Congress is able to weigh in on whether a nation should or should not be delisted as a state sponsor of terrorism is a broken process, and only one of three laws provides a legislative mechanism to stop it. Only one.

This bill aims to fix that, extending the amount of time that Congress has to review an administration's proposal to delist a country and providing Congress with a mechanism, under each law, to block its removal by enacting a joint resolution of disapproval.

It is a simple legislative fix, Mr. Speaker, that allows Congress to fulfill its oversight responsibility, determine whether these countries are still supporting terrorism, and prevent them from being delisted should there not be enough evidence for their removal.

Congress needs to have the ability that it always had and that we thought it had to weigh in on attempts to remove countries from the list and to ensure that countries that are still supporting terrorism remain sanctioned, restricted from any material that they might be receiving that could aid in their terrorism, and remain on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list where they belong.

So it makes a change to the law, the review process that should have been made a long time ago. I thank Dr. Yoho for doing this. It allows Congress to execute its proper oversight responsibilities and prevent the executive branch from delisting countries as state sponsors of terrorism prematurely.

We have seen in cases of both North Korea and Cuba, delisted by Republican and Democratic administrations respectively, that giving these nations these concessions only emboldens the rogue regimes and undermines our national security.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), the author of this important antiterrorism legislation.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and my colleague, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for the kind words and for

pointing out that, just 2 years ago, Cuba was caught shipping armaments to North Korea.

I stand in support, obviously, of the bill, H.R. 5484, the State Sponsors of Terrorism Review Enhancement Act. This designation of a foreign government, as Mr. ROYCE has already pointed out, as a state sponsor of terrorism, is one of the United States' most powerful statements as a nation that we can stamp on another country.

Besides imposing sanctions, the stamp of state sponsor of terrorism labels a state untouchable to the international community. This pariah status, as pointed out, is much deserved, as these are states that support the killing of innocent people as a matter of policy.

However, under current law, in order for a state to be delisted, the President of the United States only needs to certify that the country being considered for delisting has not engaged in supporting terrorism for a paltry 6 months. As Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN pointed out, just 2 years ago, Cuba sent missiles to North Korea.

Considering the heinous acts of violence these countries have supported in the past, we should not be allowing them to be delisted for political purposes or whatever reasons after only 6 months. This increases the oversight of one of Congress' oldest committees, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and adds another layer of protection not just for America, but for the world community.

□ 1600

To address this, my legislation will quadruple the time a designated country must refrain from sponsoring terrorism before the President can remove it from the sponsor list from 6 months to 24 months; it increases congressional oversight by doubling the time Congress has to review the President's proposed removal from 45 to 90 days; it establishes a uniform process through which Congress can disapprove of the President's decision to remove a country from the list; and it requires the administration to notify and brief Congress—and I think this is probably one of the most important things—upon initiating a review of a designated country's potential removal from that list.

This legislation will assert congressional scrutiny and oversight and, hopefully, bring to an end politically motivated delistings. Successive administrations, as was pointed out, both Republicans and Democrats alike, delisted countries based on their Precedency's legacy rather than the facts. H.R. 5484 will stop absurd delistings like that of North Korea in 2008.

As we have already talked about, North Korea was delisted in exchange for their promise of dismantling their nuclear program. However, 8 years and five nuclear tests later, as the gentleman pointed out, they remain off the list and threatening America with

their videos and their acts of irresponsibility, North Korea, supporting terrorism abroad.

By increasing the amount of time for a state to not be engaged in terrorism and increasing congressional oversight and scrutiny, H.R. 5484, hopefully, will not allow mistakes such as the delisting of North Korea to take place.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman again, and thank Mr. YOHO for his hard work and commitment on this.

Obviously, the handful of countries on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list are some of the worst actors in the world: Sudan, Syria, and Iran. We need policies that are tough, and any changes to that list must be preceded by real, permanent changes in the way those governments do business. And, of course, I believe Congress has an important oversight role to play on such matters.

I have voiced my concerns about parts of this legislation, namely, that multiplying the waiting period by a factor of four might have unintended consequences. Perhaps it should have been a little less than that. But I trust that if we do run into trouble down the road, we will do whatever it takes to make sure that our government has the tools needed to act in America's best interests.

So I support this measure and, again, I thank Mr. YOHO for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 6 months to get off of that list for a terrorist country, that is an odd situation. We should not be giving terrorist regimes a clean bill of health in such a short time in that, by definition, these are regimes that kill innocents as a matter of policy. That is what terrorism is. And given that this process has been abused, in the case of North Korea, what is to prevent another White House from removing countries from the list to advance their own flawed agendas?

Congress, I think, has a responsibility to prevent that from happening; and, ultimately, these regimes must understand that the only way to be delisted is to actually change their behavior and discontinue their support for terrorism, not simply press for their status to be reversed as a condition of a separate negotiation. That is what North Korea did some years ago. That is what concerns us here.

Again, I would like to recognize Mr. YOHO for his excellent work on this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5484.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST LOS ANGELES LEASING ACT OF 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5936) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with certain health care providers to furnish health care to veterans, to authorize the Secretary to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, to make certain improvements to the enhanced-use lease authority of the Department, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5936

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN LEASES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WEST LOS ANGELES CAMPUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out leases described in subsection (b) at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Campus").

(b) LEASES DESCRIBED.—Leases described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Any enhanced-use lease of real property under subchapter V of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, for purposes of providing supportive housing, as that term is defined in section 8161(3) of such title, that principally benefit veterans and their families.

(2) Any lease of real property for a term not to exceed 50 years to a third party to provide services that principally benefit veterans and their families and that are limited to one or more of the following purposes:

(A) The promotion of health and wellness, including nutrition and spiritual wellness.

(B) Education.

(C) Vocational training, skills building, or other training related to employment.

(D) Peer activities, socialization, or physical recreation.

(E) Assistance with legal issues and Federal benefits.

(F) Volunteerism.

(G) Family support services, including child care.

(H) Transportation.

(I) Services in support of one or more of the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) through (H).

(3) A lease of real property for a term not to exceed 10 years to The Regents of the University of California, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, on behalf of its University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) campus (hereinafter in this section referred to as "The Regents"), if—

(A) the lease is consistent with the master plan described in subsection (g);

(B) the provision of services to veterans is the predominant focus of the activities of The Regents at the Campus during the term of the lease;

(C) The Regents expressly agrees to provide, during the term of the lease and to an extent and in a manner that the Secretary considers appropriate, additional services and support (for which The Regents is not compensated by the Secretary or through an existing medical affiliation agreement) that—

(i) principally benefit veterans and their families, including veterans that are severely disabled, women, aging, or homeless; and

(ii) may consist of activities relating to the medical, clinical, therapeutic, dietary, rehabilitative, legal, mental, spiritual, physical, recreational, research, and counseling needs of veterans and their families or any of the purposes specified in any of subparagraphs (A) through (I) of paragraph (2); and

(D) The Regents maintains records documenting the value of the additional services and support that The Regents provides pursuant to subparagraph (C) for the duration of the lease and makes such records available to the Secretary.

(c) **LIMITATION ON LAND-SHARING AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may not carry out any land-sharing agreement pursuant to section 8153 of title 38, United States Code, at the Campus unless such agreement—

(1) provides additional health-care resources to the Campus; and

(2) benefits veterans and their families other than from the generation of revenue for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) **REVENUES FROM LEASES AT THE CAMPUS.**—Any funds received by the Secretary under a lease described in subsection (b) shall be credited to the applicable Department medical facilities account and shall be available, without fiscal year limitation and without further appropriation, exclusively for the renovation and maintenance of the land and facilities at the Campus.

(e) **EASEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (other than Federal laws relating to environmental and historic preservation), pursuant to section 8124 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may grant easements or rights-of-way on, above, or under lands at the Campus to—

(A) any local or regional public transportation authority to access, construct, use, operate, maintain, repair, or reconstruct public mass transit facilities, including, fixed guideway facilities and transportation centers; and

(B) the State of California, County of Los Angeles, City of Los Angeles, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, or any public utility company (including any company providing electricity, gas, water, sewage, or telecommunication services to the public) for the purpose of providing such public utilities.

(2) **IMPROVEMENTS.**—Any improvements proposed pursuant to an easement or right-of-way authorized under paragraph (1) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) **TERMINATION.**—Any easement or right-of-way authorized under paragraph (1) shall be terminated upon the abandonment or non-use of the easement or right-of-way and all right, title, and interest in the land covered by the easement or right-of-way shall revert to the United States.

(f) **PROHIBITION ON SALE OF PROPERTY.**—Notwithstanding section 8164 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may not sell or otherwise convey to a third party fee simple title to any real property or improvements to real property made at the Campus.

(g) **CONSISTENCY WITH MASTER PLAN.**—The Secretary shall ensure that each lease carried out under this section is consistent with the draft master plan approved by the Sec-

retary on January 28, 2016, or successor master plans.

(h) **COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN LAWS.**—

(1) **LAWS RELATING TO LEASES AND LAND USE.**—If the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs determines, as part of an audit report or evaluation conducted by the Inspector General, that the Department is not in compliance with all Federal laws relating to leases and land use at the Campus, or that significant mismanagement has occurred with respect to leases or land use at the Campus, the Secretary may not enter into any lease or land-sharing agreement at the Campus, or renew any such lease or land-sharing agreement that is not in compliance with such laws, until the Secretary certifies to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives who represents the area in which the Campus is located that all recommendations included in the audit report or evaluation have been implemented.

(2) **COMPLIANCE OF PARTICULAR LEASES.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided by this section, no lease may be entered into or renewed under this section unless the lease complies with chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, and all Federal laws relating to environmental and historic preservation.

(i) **VETERANS AND COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT AND ENGAGEMENT BOARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a Veterans and Community Oversight and Engagement Board (in this subsection referred to as the “Board”) for the Campus to coordinate locally with the Department of Veterans Affairs to—

(A) identify the goals of the community and veteran partnership;

(B) provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary to improve services and outcomes for veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and the families of such veterans and members; and

(C) provide advice and recommendations on the implementation of the draft master plan approved by the Secretary on January 28, 2016, and on the creation and implementation of any successor master plans.

(2) **MEMBERS.**—The Board shall be comprised of a number of members that the Secretary determines appropriate, of which not less than 50 percent shall be veterans. The nonveteran members shall be family members of veterans, veteran advocates, service providers, real estate professionals familiar with housing development projects, or stakeholders.

(3) **COMMUNITY INPUT.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Board shall—

(A) provide the community opportunities to collaborate and communicate with the Board, including by conducting public forums on the Campus; and

(B) focus on local issues regarding the Department that are identified by the community, including with respect to health care, implementation of the draft master plan and any subsequent plans, benefits, and memorial services at the Campus.

(j) **NOTIFICATION AND REPORTS.**—

(1) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—With respect to each lease or land-sharing agreement intended to be entered into or renewed at the Campus, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives who represents the area in

which the Campus is located of the intent of the Secretary to enter into or renew the lease or land-sharing agreement not later than 45 days before entering into or renewing the lease or land-sharing agreement.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives who represents the area in which the Campus is located an annual report evaluating all leases and land-sharing agreements carried out at the Campus, including—

(A) an evaluation of the management of the revenue generated by the leases; and

(B) the records described in subsection (b)(3)(D).

(3) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than each of two years and five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and as determined necessary by the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives who represents the area in which the Campus is located a report on all leases carried out at the Campus and the management by the Department of the use of land at the Campus, including an assessment of the efforts of the Department to implement the master plan described in subsection (g) with respect to the Campus.

(B) **CONSIDERATION OF ANNUAL REPORT.**—In preparing each report required by subparagraph (A), the Inspector General shall take into account the most recent report submitted to Congress by the Secretary under paragraph (2).

(k) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as a limitation on the authority of the Secretary to enter into other agreements regarding the Campus that are authorized by law and not inconsistent with this section.

(l) **PRINCIPALLY BENEFIT VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES DEFINED.**—In this section the term “principally benefit veterans and their families”, with respect to services provided by a person or entity under a lease of property or land-sharing agreement—

(1) means services—

(A) provided exclusively to veterans and their families; or

(B) that are designed for the particular needs of veterans and their families, as opposed to the general public, and any benefit of those services to the general public is distinct from the intended benefit to veterans and their families; and

(2) excludes services in which the only benefit to veterans and their families is the generation of revenue for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(m) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **PROHIBITION ON DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.**—Section 224(a) of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161; 121 Stat. 2272) is amended by striking “The Secretary of Veterans Affairs” and inserting “Except as authorized under the Los Angeles Homeless Veterans Leasing Act of 2016, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs”.

(2) **ENHANCED-USE LEASES.**—Section 8162(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, other than an enhanced-use

lease under the Los Angeles Homeless Veterans Leasing Act of 2016," before "shall be considered".

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS TO ENHANCED-USE LEASE AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON WAIVER OF OBLIGATION OF LESSEE.**—Paragraph (3) of section 8162(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the following new subparagraph:

"(D) The Secretary may not waive or postpone the obligation of a lessee to pay any consideration under an enhanced-use lease, including monthly rent."

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF LIABILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO THIRD PARTIES.**—Section 8162 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Nothing in this subchapter authorizes the Secretary to enter into an enhanced-use lease that provides for, is contingent upon, or otherwise authorizes the Federal Government to guarantee a loan made by a third party to a lessee for purposes of the enhanced-use lease.

"(2) Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to abrogate or constitute a waiver of the sovereign immunity of the United States with respect to any loan, financing, or other financial agreement entered into by the lessee and a third party relating to an enhanced-use lease."

(c) **TRANSPARENCY.**—

(1) **NOTICE.**—Section 8163(c)(1) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting "the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate" after "congressional veterans' affairs committees";

(B) by striking "and shall publish" and inserting "shall publish";

(C) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and shall submit to the congressional veterans' affairs committees a copy of the proposed lease"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "With respect to a major enhanced-use lease, upon the request of the congressional veterans' affairs committees, not later than 30 days after the date of such notice, the Secretary shall testify before the committees on the major enhanced-use lease, including with respect to the status of the lease, the cost, and the plans to carry out the activities under the lease. The Secretary may not delegate such testifying below the level of the head of the Office of Asset Enterprise Management of the Department or any successor to such office."

(2) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Section 8168 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking "to Congress" each place it appears and inserting "to the congressional veterans' affairs committees, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate";

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "Not later" and inserting "(1) Not later";

(ii) by striking "a report" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "a report on enhanced-use leases."; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

"(A) Identification of the actions taken by the Secretary to implement and administer enhanced-use leases.

"(B) For the most recent fiscal year covered by the report, the amounts deposited into the Medical Care Collection Fund account that were derived from enhanced-use leases.

"(C) Identification of the actions taken by the Secretary using the amounts described in subparagraph (B).

"(D) Documents of the Department supporting the contents of the report described in subparagraphs (A) through (C)."; and

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "Each year" and inserting "(1) Each year";

(ii) by striking "this subchapter," and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "this subchapter."; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall include the following with respect to each enhanced-use lease covered by the report:

"(A) An overview of how the Secretary is using consideration received by the Secretary under the lease to support veterans.

"(B) The amount of consideration received by the Secretary under the lease.

"(C) The amount of any revenues collected by the Secretary relating to the lease not covered by subparagraph (B), including a description of any in-kind assistance or services provided by the lessee to the Secretary or to veterans under an agreement entered into by the Secretary pursuant to any provision of law.

"(D) The costs to the Secretary of carrying out the lease.

"(E) Documents of the Department supporting the contents of the report described in subparagraphs (A) through (D)."

(d) **ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.**—Section 8161 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(4) The term 'lessee' means the party with whom the Secretary has entered into an enhanced-use lease under this subchapter.

"(5) The term 'major enhanced-use lease' means an enhanced-use lease that includes consideration consisting of an average annual rent of more than \$10,000,000."

(e) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL AUDIT.**—

(1) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an audit of the enhanced-use lease program of the Department of Veterans Affairs under subchapter V of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The financial impact of the enhanced-use lease authority on the Department of Veterans Affairs and whether the revenue realized from such authority and other financial benefits would have been realized without such authority.

(B) The use by the Secretary of such authority and whether the arrangements made under such authority would have been made without such authority.

(C) An identification of the controls that are in place to ensure accountability and transparency and to protect the Federal Government.

(D) An overall assessment of the activities of the Secretary under such authority to ensure procurement cost avoidance, negotiated cost avoidance, in-contract cost avoidance, and rate reductions.

(3) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate;

(B) the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(C) the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and provide any extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5936, as amended, the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. PRICE for his tireless efforts in working with our committee on scoring that was associated with this particular piece of legislation. Without his cooperation, we would not be poised to pass this bill today.

This bill would authorize VA to carry out certain leases on the VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System West L.A. Medical Center Campus in Los Angeles, California, in accordance with the draft master plan.

Leases that would be considered allowable under this language include: an enhanced-use lease for the purpose of providing supportive housing, any lease lasting less than 50 years to a third party to provide services that benefit veterans and their families, or a lease lasting less than 10 years to the University of California if the lease is consistent with the master plan and the University's activities are principally focused on providing services to veterans.

Any land-sharing agreements that fail to provide additional healthcare resources or to benefit veterans and their families in ways other than generating additional revenue would be prohibited, and any funds received from leases credited to the West L.A. VA Medical facility would be required to be used exclusively for renovation and maintenance.

The bill also includes numerous reporting requirements to ensure that the VA is fully transparent with Congress and the American people regarding the management use and operations of the campus.

I was honored to visit West L.A. and their medical center campus earlier this year and witness firsthand the enormous promise it holds for our veterans, especially our homeless veterans.

This historic site has suffered from many years of neglect, misuse, and mismanagement; but, with passage of H.R. 5936, as amended, today, I am confident that it will finally be on the path to preservation, revitalization,

and the fulfillment of its mission to serve and to provide for veterans in need throughout the Greater Los Angeles area.

I am grateful to my friend and colleague, Congressman TED LIEU, from California, for joining me in sponsoring this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5936. This legislation would provide a model for how VA campuses can provide services to homeless veterans and those at risk of homelessness.

It would authorize VA to carry out certain leases on the VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System West L.A. Medical Center Campus, and would prohibit VA from entering into any land-sharing agreements unless the agreements provide additional healthcare resources and also benefit veterans and their families in ways other than generating additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, there is a long history here with the West L.A. Campus. Without going into too much detail, this provision would ensure that the VA West L.A. Campus is used for the betterment of veterans, the original intent of the legacy when the land was donated decades ago. It is an important step forward for the veterans community in southern California.

I would like to thank the chairman for introducing this bill and Representative TED LIEU of California for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, so we are prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5936, as amended. And I want to express, again, my deep appreciation in working with the majority to get this bill done. It is really important to those of us in southern California, and I cannot overstate how much this means to the veterans community in California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider H.R. 5936, the Veterans Care Agreement and West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016. H.R. 5936 authorizes the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to lease underused Federal property at the Department's medical campus in Los Angeles to developers who would construct supportive housing and rehabilitation facilities for homeless veterans.

Congressional Budget Office [CBO] estimates of the budgetary effects of VA's en-

hanced-use leases have evolved over time. Dating back to the first VA enhanced-use lease in 1999, CBO believed that VA enhanced-use leasing arrangements were a quid pro quo exchange of equal value which would not have any scoring implications. As CBO continued to gather more information on these leases, in addition to monitoring and evaluating VA's behavior regarding these lease agreements, it changed its scoring practices and today scores enhanced-use leases with an upfront, direct spending cost. The evolution of CBO's VA enhanced-use lease scoring came about from agreements and contracts that assured non-Federal lessees would be able to recover their capital costs invested in leased facilities through guaranteed payments from the Federal Government.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 5936 would provide borrowing authority of \$44 million over fiscal years 2017 through 2026, which would result in new direct spending. Notwithstanding CBO's conclusion, the House Committee on the Budget believes new mandatory spending will not be provided by H.R. 5936 as amended. The Committee, working closely with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has included section 4 in H.R. 5936 that would do the following: (1) ensure the Department of Veterans Affairs and third-party enhanced-use leasing agreements do not include either an explicit or implicit Federal Government loan guarantee; (2) prevent the Federal government from abrogating its sovereign immunity with respect to any loan, or other financial agreement; and, (3) require greater transparency, accountability, and congressional oversight of VA's enhanced-use lease program. If the Department of Veterans Affairs fails to faithfully execute the requirements in H.R. 5936, the House Committee on the Budget will revisit this issue in the context of future requests for enhanced-use leasing authority.

With these fiscal protections in place, I support H.R. 5936, the Veterans Care Agreement and West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016, which ensures America's homeless veterans are provided quality access to care and services, and brings our Nation one step closer to ending veteran homelessness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5936, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, to make certain improvements to the enhanced-use lease authority of the Department, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS MOBILITY SAFETY ACT OF 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 3471) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the provision of automobiles and adaptive equipment by the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3471

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Mobility Safety Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PERSONAL SELECTIONS OF AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT.

Section 3903(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "Except" and inserting "(1) Except"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary shall ensure that to the extent practicable an eligible person who is provided an automobile or other conveyance under this chapter is given the opportunity to make personal selections relating to such automobile or other conveyance."

SEC. 3. COMPREHENSIVE POLICY FOR THE AUTOMOBILES ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE POLICY.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop a comprehensive policy regarding quality standards for providers who provide modification services to veterans under the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(b) SCOPE.—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall cover each of the following:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs-wide management of the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(2) The development of standards for safety and quality of equipment and installation of equipment through the automobile adaptive equipment program, including with respect to the defined differentiations in levels of modification complexity.

(3) The consistent application of standards for safety and quality of both equipment and installation throughout the Department.

(4) The certification of a provider by a third party organization or manufacturer if the Secretary designates the quality standards of such organization or manufacturer as meeting or exceeding the standards developed under this section.

(5) The education and training of personnel of the Department who administer the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(6) The compliance of the provider with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) when furnishing automobile adaptive equipment at the facility of the provider.

(7) The allowance, where technically appropriate, for veterans to receive modifications at their residence or location of choice.

(c) UPDATES.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update Veterans Health Administration Handbook 1173.4, or any successor handbook or directive, in accordance with the policy developed under subsection (a). Not less frequently than once every six years thereafter, the Secretary shall update such handbook, or any successor handbook or directive.

(d) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall develop the policy under subsection (a), and revise such policy under subsection (c), in consultation with veterans service organizations, the National Highway Transportation Administration, industry representatives, manufacturers of automobile adaptive equipment, and other entities with expertise in installing, repairing, replacing, or manufacturing mobility equipment

or developing mobility accreditation standards for automobile adaptive equipment.

(e) **CONFLICTS.**—In developing and implementing the policy under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) minimize the possibility of conflicts of interest, to the extent practicable; and

(2) establish procedures that ensure against the use of a certifying entity referred to in subsection (b)(4) that has a financial conflict of interest regarding the certification of an eligible provider.

(f) **BIENNIAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date on which the Secretary updates Veterans Health Administration Handbook 1173.4, or any successor handbook or directive, under subsection (c), and biennially thereafter through 2022, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the implementation and facility compliance with the policy developed under subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the implementation plan for the policy developed under subsection (a) and any revisions to such policy under subsection (c).

(B) A description of the performance measures used to determine the effectiveness of such policy in ensuring the safety of veterans enrolled in the automobile adaptive equipment program.

(C) An assessment of safety issues due to improper installations based on a survey of recipients of adaptive equipment from the Department.

(D) An assessment of the adequacy of the adaptive equipment services of the Department based on a survey of recipients of adaptive equipment from the Department.

(E) An assessment of the training provided to the personnel of the Department with respect to administering the program.

(F) An assessment of the certified providers of the Department of adaptive equipment with respect to meeting the minimum standards developed under subsection (b)(2).

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “automobile adaptive equipment program” means the program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “veterans service organization” means any organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. APPOINTMENT OF LICENSED HEARING AID SPECIALISTS IN VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **LICENSED HEARING AID SPECIALISTS.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—Section 7401(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting “licensed hearing aid specialists,” after “Audiologists.”

(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Section 7402(b)(14) of such title is amended by inserting “, hearing aid specialist” after “dental technologist”.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—With respect to appointing hearing aid specialists under sections 7401 and 7402 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), and providing services furnished by such specialists, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) a hearing aid specialist may only perform hearing services consistent with the hearing aid specialist's State license related to the practice of fitting and dispensing hearing aids without excluding other qualified professionals, including audiologists, from rendering services in overlapping practice areas;

(2) services provided to veterans by hearing aid specialists shall be provided as part of the non-medical treatment plan developed by an audiologist; and

(3) the medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs provide to veterans access to the full range of professional services provided by an audiologist.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—In determining the qualifications required for hearing aid specialists and in carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with veterans service organizations, audiologists, otolaryngologists, hearing aid specialists, and other stakeholder and industry groups as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter during the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(A) Timely access of veterans to hearing health services through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) Contracting policies of the Department with respect to providing hearing health services to veterans in facilities that are not facilities of the Department.

(2) **TIMELY ACCESS TO SERVICES.**—Each report shall, with respect to the matter specified in paragraph (1)(A) for the one-year period preceding the submittal of such report, include the following:

(A) The staffing levels of audiologists, hearing aid specialists, and health technicians in audiology in the Veterans Health Administration.

(B) A description of the metrics used by the Secretary in measuring performance with respect to appointments and care relating to hearing health.

(C) The average time that a veteran waits to receive an appointment, beginning on the date on which the veteran makes the request, for the following:

(i) A disability rating evaluation for a hearing-related disability.

(ii) A hearing aid evaluation.

(iii) Dispensing of hearing aids.

(iv) Any follow-up hearing health appointment.

(D) The percentage of veterans whose total wait time for appointments described in subparagraph (C), including an initial and follow-up appointment, if applicable, is more than 30 days.

(3) **CONTRACTING POLICIES.**—Each report shall, with respect to the matter specified in paragraph (1)(B) for the one-year period preceding the submittal of such report, include the following:

(A) The number of veterans that the Secretary refers to non-Department audiologists for hearing health care appointments.

(B) The number of veterans that the Secretary refers to non-Department hearing aid specialists for follow-up appointments for a hearing aid evaluation, the dispensing of hearing aids, or any other purpose relating to hearing health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3471, as amended, the Veterans Mobility Safety Act of 2016.

This bill is sponsored by my friend and committee member, Congresswoman JACKIE WALORSKI from Indiana, and includes a provision from H.R. 353, the Veterans' Access to Hearing Health Act of 2015, which is sponsored by Congressman SEAN DUFFY from Wisconsin. I am very grateful to both of them for their efforts.

H.R. 3471, as amended, would direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to develop a comprehensive policy regarding quality standards for providers who dispense modification services to veterans under the Automobile Adaptive Equipment program.

VA's current handbook governing the Automobile Adaptive Equipment program has not been updated since it was released in 2000, despite being scheduled for recertification in 2005. Allowing the handbook for this important program to get so outdated is troublesome to me, given that improperly installed automobile adaptive equipment carries risks for our disabled veterans and for all those sharing America's roads.

The bill would also authorize VA to hire and prescribe qualified qualifications for hiring hearing aid specialists. One of my highest priorities as chairman has been ensuring that our Nation's veterans receive timely access to quality care.

That is why I was so frustrated by an audit issued by the VA inspector general in 2014 which found that VA took 17 to 24 days to complete hearing aid repair services and that, nationally, 30 percent of veterans waited more than 30 days from the estimated date that the VA medical facility had received the hearing aid from a vendor to the date the medical facility actually issued the hearing aid to the veteran themselves.

Too many veterans relying on hearing aids cannot wait for weeks or months for VA to make repairs, and I am hopeful that, by authorizing VA to hire hearing aid specialists to assist with basic hearing aid repairs, they will no longer have to wait.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation brought forward by my colleague, Representative WALORSKI.

This bill directs VA to ensure that an eligible disabled veteran who has been provided with an automobile is given the opportunity to make personal selections relating to the automobile. The provider of any adaptive equipment modification services must be certified by a certification organization or the manufacturer of the adaptive equipment.

In addition, the provider of the automobile or adaptive equipment or the

provider of the modification services must adhere to specific requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

Mr. Speaker, I think these are important protections for those veterans who need to personalize the vehicles they drive.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI). She represents the Second Congressional District of Indiana, "Gin Town."

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Veterans Mobility Safety Act. This legislation will improve veterans' care and ensure the quality of the automobile adaptive equipment and hearing aids disabled veterans depend on.

Automotive mobility plays a vital role in helping our disabled veterans live a normal life after being wounded on the battlefield. The VA's Automobile Adaptive Equipment, or AAE, program provides eligible disabled veterans with an automobile or modification, such as wheelchair lifts and reduced-effort steering and braking, to existing vehicles to improve their quality of life.

Under the current AAE program, local VA facilities operate based upon their own interpretations of VA procedures that haven't been updated since 2000. It lacks quality standards for providers as well. As you can imagine, this fragmented and outdated system has resulted in cases of improperly installed equipment that caused serious safety issues for both the veteran and the driving public.

My legislation requires the VA to develop a comprehensive policy regarding quality standards for providers that participate in the AAE program in close consultation with a host of stakeholders, including veterans service organizations, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, and industry representatives. The result will be a veteran-centric policy that ensures access to safe, quality equipment. Lastly, it would require VA to update the AAE program handbook to reflect the new policy, along with biennial reports on implementation and compliance.

This legislation also includes Congressman DUFFY's bill that would allow the VA to utilize hearing aid specialists to help fill the need for certain hearing aid services. This legislation will decrease audiologists' workload and allow them to focus on special cases and complex conditions while also decreasing the wait time for a veteran who just needs a quick tweak to their hearing aid.

I want to thank the chairman for all his work on veterans' issues. I want to also thank Representatives BROWNLEY

and RUIZ for their work on this legislation. Lastly, I want to thank Paralyzed Veterans of America for all of their help and all other veterans service organizations for all of their hard work advocating for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 3471, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3471, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION TO ACQUIRE, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE MEMORIAL

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5937) to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to acquire, operate, and maintain the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes-la-Coquette, France, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5937

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY OF THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION TO ACQUIRE, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 21 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2115. Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

"The American Battle Monuments Commission may enter into an agreement with the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation to acquire, operate, and maintain the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes-la-Coquette, France. Under such an agreement, the Commission shall make necessary arrangements to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the memorial, including the cemetery at the memorial that contains the remains of 49 aviators of the United States who died during World War I."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 21 of such title is amended by adding at the end of the following new item:

"2115. Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of Lafayette Escadrille Memorial."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous materials to H.R. 5937, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5937, as amended. I want to thank Chairman ED ROYCE of the Foreign Affairs Committee and his staff for their assistance in expeditiously scheduling this bill.

My bill would ensure that the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial located outside of Paris, France, will continue to be cared for in a manner that honors America's servicemembers who fought in World War I.

Before the United States entered World War I, 269 brave American volunteers flew in combat missions in the French Air Service. These Americans were referred to as the Lafayette Escadrille after Marquis de Lafayette, the Frenchman who was instrumental to America's victory during the Revolutionary War. Unfortunately, 68 members of the Lafayette Escadrille lost their lives during the war, and the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial contains a crypt that serves as the final resting place for 49 of these brave Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Since 1928, the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial has been operated by the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation. The foundation is running out of funds that are needed to maintain the memorial.

H.R. 5937, as amended, would authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to acquire, operate, and maintain the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial, which would guarantee that the memorial receives the care it deserves as a final resting place for Americans.

The ABMC, a Federal agency, currently operates numerous American military cemeteries and memorials in foreign countries. The ABMC is well equipped to ensure that the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial continues to stand as a reminder that Americans fought all around the world in the name of freedom. So I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5937, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Chairman MILLER's bill that would authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to acquire, operate, and maintain the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes-la-Coquette, France.

This request was brought to us directly from the American Battle Monuments Commission in order to ensure that this memorial that honors the service and sacrifice of the Lafayette Flying Corps is properly maintained.

The Lafayette Flying Corps was a small group of American aviators who volunteered to serve in the Lafayette Escadrille prior to the United States entering World War I. Forty-nine members of the Lafayette Flying Corps lost their lives in the war and are interred in the crypts below the memorial.

This incredible group included "Lucky" Herschel McKee, who became their youngest ace with 12 kills, and Eugene James Bullard, the first African American military pilot who was subsequently made a knight of the Legion of Honor, France's most coveted award established by Napoleon Bonaparte.

This important effort will incur no additional costs as the ABMC has indicated that they can maintain this important memorial within their existing appropriations.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of passage of this important legislation that honors the services and sacrifice of our men and women that defend our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, H.R. 5937, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I too would urge all colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5937), as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSURING ACCESS TO PACIFIC FISHERIES ACT

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4576) to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Access to Pacific Fisheries Act".

TITLE I—NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COMMISSION.**—The term "Commission" means the North Pacific Fisheries Commission established in accordance with the North Pacific Fisheries Convention.

(2) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term "Commissioner" means a United States Commissioner appointed under section 102(a).

(3) **CONVENTION AREA.**—The term "Convention Area" means the area to which the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean applies under Article 4 of such Convention.

(4) **COUNCIL.**—The term "Council" means the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, or the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council established under section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852), as the context requires.

(5) **EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE.**—The term "exclusive economic zone" means—

(A) with respect to the United States, the zone established by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 5030 of March 10, 1983 (16 U.S.C. 1453 note); and

(B) with respect to a foreign country, a designated zone similar to the zone referred to in subparagraph (A) for that country, consistent with international law.

(6) **FISHERIES RESOURCES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "fisheries resources" means all fish, mollusks, crustaceans, and other marine species caught by a fishing vessel within the Convention Area, as well as any products thereof.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term "fisheries resources" does not include—

(i) sedentary species insofar as they are subject to the sovereign rights of coastal nations consistent with Article 77, paragraph 4 of the 1982 Convention and indicator species of vulnerable marine ecosystems as listed in, or adopted pursuant to, Article 13, paragraph 5 of the North Pacific Fisheries Convention;

(ii) catadromous species;

(iii) marine mammals, marine reptiles, or seabirds; or

(iv) other marine species already covered by preexisting international fisheries management instruments within the area of competence of such instruments.

(7) **FISHING ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term "fishing activities" means—

(i) the actual or attempted searching for, catching, taking, or harvesting of fisheries resources;

(ii) engaging in any activity that can reasonably be expected to result in the locating, catching, taking, or harvesting of fisheries resources for any purpose;

(iii) the processing of fisheries resources at sea;

(iv) the transshipment of fisheries resources at sea or in port; or

(v) any operation at sea in direct support of, or in preparation for, any activity described in clauses (i) through (iv), including transshipment.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term "fishing activities" does not include any operation related to an emergency involving the health or safety of a crew member or the safety of a fishing vessel.

(8) **FISHING VESSEL.**—The term "fishing vessel" means any vessel used or intended for use

for the purpose of engaging in fishing activities, including a processing vessel, a support ship, a carrier vessel, or any other vessel directly engaged in such fishing activities.

(9) **HIGH SEAS.**—The term "high seas" does not include an area that is within the exclusive economic zone of the United States or of any other country.

(10) **NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION.**—The term "North Pacific Fisheries Convention" means the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean (including any annexes, amendments, or protocols that are in force, or have come into force) for the United States, which was adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012.

(11) **PERSON.**—The term "person" means—

(A) any individual, whether or not a citizen or national of the United States;

(B) any corporation, partnership, association, or other entity, whether or not organized or existing under the laws of any State; or

(C) any Federal, State, local, tribal, or foreign government or any entity of such government.

(12) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(13) **STATE.**—The term "State" means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(14) **STRADDLING STOCK.**—The term "straddling stock" means a stock of fisheries resources that migrates between, or occurs in, the economic exclusion zone of one or more parties to the Convention and the Convention Area.

(15) **TRANSHIPMENT.**—The term "transshipment" means the unloading of any fisheries resources taken in the Convention Area from one fishing vessel to another fishing vessel either at sea or in port.

(16) **1982 CONVENTION.**—The term "1982 Convention" means the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982.

SEC. 102. UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION.

(a) **UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS.**—

(1) **NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS.**—The United States shall be represented on the Commission by 5 United States Commissioners.

(2) **SELECTION OF COMMISSIONERS.**—The Commissioners shall be as follows:

(A) **APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Two of the Commissioners shall be appointed by the President and shall be an officer or employee of—

(I) the Department of Commerce;

(II) the Department of State; or

(III) the Coast Guard.

(ii) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—In making each appointment under clause (i), the President shall select a Commissioner from among individuals who are knowledgeable or experienced concerning fisheries resources in the North Pacific Ocean.

(B) **NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.**—One Commissioner shall be the chairman of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council or a designee of such chairman.

(C) **PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.**—One Commissioner shall be the chairman of the Pacific Fishery Management Council or a designee of such chairperson.

(D) **WESTERN PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.**—One Commissioner shall be the chairman of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council or a designee of such chairperson.

(b) **ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS.**—In the event of a vacancy in a position as a Commissioner appointed under subsection (a), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, may designate from time to time and for periods of time considered appropriate an alternate Commissioner to the Commission. An alternate Commissioner may exercise all powers and duties of

a Commissioner in the absence of a Commissioner appointed under subsection (a), and shall serve the remainder of the term of the absent Commissioner for which designated.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—

(1) EMPLOYMENT STATUS.—An individual serving as a Commissioner, or an alternative Commissioner, other than an officer or employee of the United States Government, shall not be considered a Federal employee, except for the purposes of injury compensation or tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) COMPENSATION.—An individual serving as a Commissioner or an alternate Commissioner, although an officer of the United States while so serving, shall receive no compensation for the individual's services as such Commissioner or alternate Commissioner.

(3) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall pay the necessary travel expenses of a Commissioner or an alternate Commissioner in accordance with the Federal Travel Regulations and sections 5701, 5702, 5704 through 5708, and 5731 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary may reimburse the Secretary of State for amounts expended by the Secretary of State under this paragraph.

SEC. 103. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

The Secretary of State may—

(1) receive and transmit, on behalf of the United States, reports, requests, recommendations, proposals, decisions, and other communications of and to the Commission;

(2) in consultation with the Secretary, act upon, or refer to another appropriate authority, any communication received pursuant to paragraph (1);

(3) with the concurrence of the Secretary, and in accordance with the Convention, object to the decisions of the Commission; and

(4) request and utilize on a reimbursed or non-reimbursed basis the assistance, services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of other Federal departments and agencies, foreign governments or agencies, or international intergovernmental organizations, in the conduct of scientific research and other programs under this title.

SEC. 104. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and, with respect to enforcement measures, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, may promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the United States international obligations under the North Pacific Fisheries Convention and this title, including recommendations and decisions adopted by the Commission.

(2) REGULATIONS OF STRADDLING STOCKS.—In the implementation of a measure adopted by the Commission that would govern a straddling stock under the authority of a Council, any regulation promulgated by the Secretary to implement such measure within the exclusive economic zone shall be approved by such Council.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall be applicable only to a person or a fishing vessel that is or has engaged in fishing activities, or fisheries resources covered by the North Pacific Fisheries Convention under this title.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may conduct, and may request and utilize on a reimbursed or nonreimbursed basis the assistance, services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of other Federal departments and agencies in—

(1) scientific, research, and other programs under this title;

(2) fishing operations and biological experiments for purposes of scientific investigation or other purposes necessary to implement the North Pacific Fisheries Convention;

(3) the collection, utilization, and disclosure of such information as may be necessary to implement the North Pacific Fisheries Convention, subject to sections 552 and 552a of title 5, United States Code, and section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1881a(b));

(4) the issuance of permits to owners and operators of United States vessels to engage in fishing activities in the Convention Area seaward of the exclusive economic zone of the United States, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, including the period of time that a permit is valid; and

(5) if recommended by the United States Commissioners, the assessment and collection of fees, not to exceed 3 percent of the ex-vessel value of fisheries resources harvested by vessels of the United States in fisheries conducted in the Convention Area, to recover the actual costs to the United States to carry out the functions of the Secretary under this title.

(d) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER LAWS.—The Secretary shall ensure the consistency, to the extent practicable, of fishery management programs administered under this title, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), the South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 973 et seq.), section 401 of Public Law 108–219 (16 U.S.C. 1821 note) (relating to Pacific albacore tuna), the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (16 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567) and the amendments made by that Act, and Public Law 100–629 (102 Stat. 3286).

(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Regulations promulgated by the Secretary under this title shall be subject to judicial review to the extent authorized by, and in accordance with, chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, if a petition for such review is filed not later than 30 days after the date on which the regulations are promulgated.

(2) RESPONSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall file a response to any petition filed in accordance with paragraph (1), not later than 30 days after the date the Secretary is served with that petition, except that the appropriate court may extend the period for filing such a response upon a showing by the Secretary of good cause for that extension.

(3) COPIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.—A response of the Secretary under paragraph (2) shall include a copy of the administrative record for the regulations that are the subject of the petition.

(4) EXPEDITED HEARINGS.—Upon a motion by the person who files a petition under this subsection, the appropriate court shall assign the matter for hearing at the earliest possible date.

SEC. 105. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating—

(1) shall administer and enforce this title and any regulations issued under this title; and

(2) may request and utilize on a reimbursed or nonreimbursed basis the assistance, services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of other Federal departments and agencies in the administration and enforcement of this title.

(b) SECRETARIAL ACTIONS.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prevent any person from violating this title with respect to fishing activities or the conservation of fisheries resources in the Convention Area in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same

jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though sections 308 through 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858, 1859, 1860, and 1861) were incorporated into and made a part of this title. Any person that violates this title is subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, power, and duties as though sections 308 through 311 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1858, 1859, 1860, and 1861) were incorporated into and made a part of this title.

(c) JURISDICTION OF THE COURTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over any case or controversy arising under this title, and any such court may at any time—

(A) enter restraining orders or prohibitions;

(B) issue warrants, process in rem, or other process;

(C) prescribe and accept satisfactory bonds or other security; and

(D) take such other actions as are in the interest of justice.

(2) HAWAII AND PACIFIC INSULAR AREAS.—In the case of Hawaii or any possession of the United States in the Pacific Ocean, the appropriate court is the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, except that—

(A) in the case of Guam and Wake Island, the appropriate court is the United States District Court for the District of Guam; and

(B) in the case of the Northern Mariana Islands, the appropriate court is the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Each violation shall be a separate offense and the offense is deemed to have been committed not only in the district where the violation first occurred, but also in any other district authorized by law. Any offense not committed in any district is subject to the venue provisions of section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any information submitted to the Secretary in compliance with any requirement under this title, and information submitted under any requirement of this title that may be necessary to implement the Convention, including information submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be confidential and may not be disclosed, except—

(A) to a Federal employee who is responsible for administering, implementing, or enforcing this title;

(B) to the Commission, in accordance with requirements in the North Pacific Fisheries Convention and decisions of the Commission, and, insofar as possible, in accordance with an agreement with the Commission that prevents public disclosure of the identity or business of any person;

(C) to State, Council, or marine fisheries commission employees pursuant to an agreement with the Secretary that prevents public disclosure of the identity or business of any person;

(D) when required by court order; or

(E) when the Secretary has obtained written authorization from the person submitting such information to release such information to another person for a reason not otherwise provided for in this paragraph, and such release does not violate other requirements of this title.

(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall promulgate regulations regarding the procedures the Secretary considers necessary to preserve the confidentiality of information submitted under this title.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may release or make public information submitted under this title if the information is in any aggregate or

summary form that does not directly or indirectly disclose the identity or business of any person.

(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted or construed to prevent the use for conservation and management purposes by the Secretary of any information submitted under this title.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITED ACTS.

It is unlawful for any person—

(1) to violate this title or any regulation or permit issued under this title;

(2) to use any fishing vessel to engage in fishing activities without, or after the revocation or during the period of suspension of, an applicable permit pursuant to this title;

(3) to refuse to permit any officer authorized to enforce this title to board a fishing vessel subject to such person's control for the purposes of conducting any search, investigation, or inspection in connection with the enforcement of this title or any regulation, permit, or the North Pacific Fisheries Convention;

(4) to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with any such authorized officer in the conduct of any search, investigation, or inspection in connection with the enforcement of this title or any regulation, permit, or the North Pacific Fisheries Convention;

(5) to resist a lawful arrest for any act prohibited by this title or any regulation promulgated or permit issued under this title;

(6) to ship, transport, offer for sale, sell, purchase, import, export, or have custody, control, or possession of, any fisheries resources taken or retained in violation of this title or any regulation or permit referred to in paragraph (1) or (2);

(7) to interfere with, delay, or prevent, by any means, the apprehension or arrest of another person, knowing that such other person has committed any act prohibited by this section;

(8) to submit to the Secretary false information (including false information regarding the capacity and extent to which a United States fish processor, on an annual basis, will process a portion of the optimum yield of a fishery that will be harvested by fishing vessels of the United States), regarding any matter that the Secretary is considering in the course of carrying out this title;

(9) to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, sexually harass, bribe, or interfere with any observer on a vessel under this title, or any data collector employed by or under contract to any person to carry out responsibilities under this title;

(10) to engage in fishing activities in violation of any regulation adopted pursuant to this title;

(11) to fail to make, keep, or furnish any catch returns, statistical records, or other reports required by regulations adopted pursuant to this title to be made, kept, or furnished;

(12) to fail to stop a vessel upon being hailed and instructed to stop by a duly authorized official of the United States;

(13) to import, in violation of any regulation adopted pursuant to this title, any fisheries resources in any form of those species subject to regulation pursuant to a recommendation, resolution, or decision of the Commission, or any fisheries resources in any form not under regulation but under investigation by the Commission, during the period such fisheries resources have been denied entry in accordance with this title;

(14) to make or submit any false record, account, or label for, or any false identification of, any fisheries resources that have been, or are intended to be imported, exported, transported, sold, offered for sale, purchased, or received in interstate or foreign commerce; or

(15) to refuse to authorize and accept boarding by a duly authorized inspector pursuant to procedures adopted by the Commission for the boarding and inspection of fishing vessels in the Convention Area.

SEC. 107. COOPERATION IN CARRYING OUT CONVENTION.

(a) **FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES; PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS.**—The Secretary may cooperate with any Federal agency, any public or private institution or organization within the United States or abroad, and, through the Secretary of State, a duly authorized official of the government of any party to the North Pacific Fisheries Convention, in carrying out responsibilities under this title.

(b) **SCIENTIFIC AND OTHER PROGRAMS; FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.**—Each Federal agency may, upon the request of the Secretary, cooperate in the conduct of scientific and other programs and furnish facilities and personnel for the purpose of assisting the Commission in carrying out its duties under the North Pacific Fisheries Convention.

(c) **SANCTIONED FISHING OPERATIONS AND BIOLOGICAL EXPERIMENTS.**—Nothing in this title, or in the laws of any State, prevents the Secretary or the Commission from—

(1) conducting or authorizing the conduct of fishing operations and biological experiments at any time for purposes of scientific investigation; or

(2) discharging any other duties prescribed by the North Pacific Fisheries Convention.

(d) **STATE JURISDICTION NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to diminish or to increase the jurisdiction of any State in the territorial sea of the United States.

SEC. 108. TERRITORIAL PARTICIPATION.

The Secretary of State shall ensure participation in the Commission and its subsidiary bodies by the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam to the extent allowed under United States law.

SEC. 109. EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE NOTIFICATION.

Masters of commercial fishing vessels of countries fishing under the management authority of the North Pacific Fisheries Convention that do not carry vessel monitoring systems capable of communicating with United States enforcement authorities shall, prior to or as soon as reasonably possible after, entering and transiting the exclusive economic zone bounded by the Convention Area, ensure that all fishing gear on board the vessel is stowed below deck or otherwise removed from the place it is normally used for fishing activities and placed where it is not readily available for fishing activities.

TITLE II—IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF HIGH SEAS FISHERY RESOURCES IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC OCEAN

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **1982 CONVENTION.**—The term “1982 Convention” means the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Commission of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization established in accordance with the South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention.

(3) **CONVENTION AREA.**—The term “Convention Area” means the area to which the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean applies under Article 5 of such Convention.

(4) **COUNCIL.**—The term “Council” means the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

(5) **EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE.**—The term “exclusive economic zone” means—

(A) with respect to the United States, the zone established by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 5030 of March 10, 1983 (16 U.S.C. 1453 note); and

(B) with respect to a foreign country, a designated zone similar to the zone referred to in subparagraph (A) for that country, consistent with international law.

(6) **FISHERY RESOURCES.**—The term “fishery resources” means all fish, mollusks, crustaceans, and other marine species, and any products thereof, caught by a fishing vessel within the Convention Area, but excluding—

(A) sedentary species insofar as they are subject to the national jurisdiction of coastal States pursuant to Article 77 paragraph 4 of the 1982 Convention;

(B) highly migratory species listed in Annex I of the 1982 Convention;

(C) anadromous and catadromous species; and

(D) marine mammals, marine reptiles and sea birds.

(7) **FISHING.**—The term “fishing”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means—

(i) the actual or attempted searching for, catching, taking, or harvesting of fishery resources;

(ii) engaging in any activity that can reasonably be expected to result in the locating, catching, taking or harvesting of fishery resources for any purpose;

(iii) transshipment and any operation at sea, in support of, or in preparation for, any activity described in this subparagraph; and

(iv) the use of any vessel, vehicle, aircraft, or hovercraft in relation to any activity described in this subparagraph; and

(B) does not include any operation related to emergencies involving the health and safety of crew members or the safety of a fishing vessel.

(8) **FISHING VESSEL.**—The term “fishing vessel” means any vessel used or intended to be used for fishing, including any fish processing vessel support ship, carrier vessel, or any other vessel directly engaged in fishing operations.

(9) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means any individual (whether or not a citizen or national of the United States); any corporation, partnership, association, or other entity (whether or not organized or existing under the laws of any State); and any Federal, State, local, or foreign government or any entity of any such government.

(10) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(11) **SOUTH PACIFIC FISHERY RESOURCES CONVENTION.**—The term “South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention” means the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean (including any annexes, amendments, or protocols that are in force, or have come into force, for the United States), which was adopted at Auckland, New Zealand, on November 14, 2009, by the International Consultations on the Proposed South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization.

(12) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

SEC. 202. APPOINTMENT OR DESIGNATION OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS.

(a) **APPOINTMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States shall be represented on the Commission by not more than 3 Commissioners. In making each appointment, the President shall select a Commissioner from among individuals who are knowledgeable or experienced concerning fishery resources in the South Pacific Ocean.

(2) **REPRESENTATION.**—At least one of the Commissioners shall be—

(A) serving at the pleasure of the President, an officer or employee of—

(i) the Department of Commerce;

(ii) the Department of State; or

(iii) the Coast Guard; and

(B) the chairperson or designee of the Council.

(b) **ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS.**—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, may designate from time to time and for

periods of time considered appropriate an alternate Commissioner to the Commission. An alternate Commissioner may exercise all powers and duties of a Commissioner in the absence of a Commissioner appointed under subsection (a).

(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.**—

(1) **EMPLOYMENT STATUS.**—An individual serving as a Commissioner, or as an alternate Commissioner, other than an officer or employee of the United States Government, shall not be considered a Federal employee, except for the purposes of injury compensation or tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) **COMPENSATION.**—An individual serving as a Commissioner or an alternate Commissioner, although an officer of the United States while so serving, shall receive no compensation for the individual's services as such Commissioner or alternate Commissioner.

(3) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall pay the necessary travel expenses of a Commissioner or an alternate Commissioner in accordance with the Federal Travel Regulations and sections 5701, 5702, 5704 through 5708, and 5731 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—The Secretary may reimburse the Secretary of State for amounts expended by the Secretary of State under this paragraph.

SEC. 203. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

The Secretary of State may—

(1) receive and transmit, on behalf of the United States, reports, requests, recommendations, proposals, decisions, and other communications of and to the Commission;

(2) in consultation with the Secretary, act upon, or refer to other appropriate authority, any communication pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(3) with the concurrence of the Secretary, and in accordance with the South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention, object to decisions of the Commission.

SEC. 204. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY AND RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

(a) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Secretary may—

(1) administer this title and any regulations issued under this title, except to the extent otherwise provided for in this title;

(2) issue permits to vessels subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and to owners and operators of such vessels, to fish in the Convention Area, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe; and

(3) if recommended by the United States Commissioners, assess and collect fees, not to exceed 3 percent of the ex-vessel value of fisheries resources harvested by vessels of the United States in fisheries conducted in the Convention Area, to recover the actual costs to the United States to carry out the functions of the Secretary under this title.

(b) **PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, may promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the international obligations of the United States under the South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention and this title, including decisions adopted by the Commission.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—Regulations promulgated under this subsection shall be applicable only to a person or fishing vessel that is or has engaged in fishing, and fishery resources covered by the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean under this title.

(c) **CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER LAWS.**—The Secretary shall ensure the consistency, to the extent practicable, of fishery management programs administered under this title, the Magnu-

son-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), the South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 973 et seq.), section 401 of Public Law 108-219 (16 U.S.C. 1821 note) (relating to Pacific albacore tuna), the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act (16 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567) and the amendments made by that Act, and Public Law 100-629 (102 Stat. 3286).

(d) **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Regulations promulgated by the Secretary under this title shall be subject to judicial review to the extent authorized by, and in accordance with, chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, if a petition for such review is filed not later than 30 days after the date on which the regulations are promulgated or the action is published in the Federal Register, as applicable.

(2) **RESPONSES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall file a response to any petition filed in accordance with paragraph (1) not later than 30 days after the date the Secretary is served with that petition, except that the appropriate court may extend the period for filing such a response upon a showing by the Secretary of good cause for that extension.

(3) **COPIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.**—A response of the Secretary under paragraph (2) shall include a copy of the administrative record for the regulations that are the subject of the petition.

(4) **EXPEDITED HEARINGS.**—Upon a motion by the person who files a petition under this subsection, the appropriate court shall assign the matter for hearing at the earliest possible date.

SEC. 205. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **RESPONSIBILITY.**—This title, and any regulations or permits issued under this title, shall be enforced by the Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating. Such Secretaries shall, and the head of any Federal or State agency that has entered into an agreement with either such Secretary under this section may (if the agreement so provides), authorize officers to enforce this title or any regulation promulgated under this title. Any officer so authorized may enforce this title in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though section 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861) were incorporated into and made a part of this title.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.**—The Secretary shall prevent any person from violating this title in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though sections 308 through 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858 through 1861) were incorporated into and made a part of this title.

(c) **DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION.**—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over any actions arising under this section. Notwithstanding subsection (b), for the purpose of this section, for Hawaii or any possession of the United States in the Pacific Ocean, the appropriate court is the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, except that in the case of Guam and Wake Island, the appropriate court is the United States District Court for the District of Guam, and except that in the case of the Northern Mariana

Islands, the appropriate court is the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands. Each violation shall be a separate offense and the offense is deemed to have been committed not only in the district where the violation first occurred, but also in any other district as authorized by law. Any offenses not committed in any district are subject to the venue provisions of section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 206. PROHIBITED ACTS.

It is unlawful for any person—

(1) to violate any provision of this title or of any regulation promulgated or permit issued under this title;

(2) to use any fishing vessel to engage in fishing without a valid permit or after the revocation, or during the period of suspension, of an applicable permit pursuant to this title;

(3) to refuse to permit any officer authorized to enforce this title to board a fishing vessel subject to such person's control for the purposes of conducting any investigation or inspection in connection with the enforcement of this title;

(4) to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with any such authorized officer in the conduct of any search, investigation, or inspection in connection with the enforcement of this title or any regulation promulgated or permit issued under this title;

(5) to resist a lawful arrest for any act prohibited by this title or any regulation promulgated or permit issued under this title;

(6) to ship, transport, offer for sale, sell, purchase, import, export, or have custody, control, or possession of, any fishery resources taken or retained in violation of this title or any regulation or permit referred to in paragraph (1) or (2);

(7) to interfere with, delay, or prevent, by any means, the apprehension or arrest of another person, knowing that such other person has committed any act prohibited by this title;

(8) to submit to the Secretary false information, regarding any matter that the Secretary is considering in the course of carrying out this title;

(9) to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, sexually harass, bribe, or interfere with any observer on a vessel pursuant to the requirements of this title, or any data collector employed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or under contract to any person to carry out responsibilities under this title;

(10) to fail to make, keep, or furnish any catch returns, statistical records, or other reports as are required by regulations adopted pursuant to this title to be made, kept, or furnished;

(11) to fail to stop a vessel upon being hailed and instructed to stop by a duly authorized official of the United States;

(12) to import, in violation of any regulation promulgated under this title, any fishery resources in any form of those species subject to regulation pursuant to a decision of the Commission;

(13) to make or submit any false record, account, or label for, or any false identification of, any fishery resources that have been or are intended to be imported, exported, transported, sold, offered for sale, purchased, or received in interstate or foreign commerce; or

(14) to refuse to authorize and accept boarding by a duly authorized inspector pursuant to procedures adopted by the Commission for the boarding and inspection of fishing vessels in the Convention Area.

SEC. 207. COOPERATION IN CARRYING OUT THE CONVENTION.

(a) **FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES; PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS.**—The Secretary may cooperate with agencies of the United States Government, any public or private institutions or organizations within the United States or abroad, and, through the Secretary of State, the duly authorized officials of the government of any party to the South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention, in carrying out responsibilities under this title.

(b) **SCIENTIFIC AND OTHER PROGRAMS; FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.**—All Federal agencies may, upon the request of the Secretary, cooperate in the conduct of scientific and other programs and to furnish facilities and personnel for the purpose of assisting the Commission in carrying out its duties under the South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention.

(c) **SANCTIONED FISHING OPERATIONS AND BIOLOGICAL EXPERIMENTS.**—Nothing in this title, or in the laws or regulations of any State, prevents the Secretary or the Commission from—

(1) conducting or authorizing the conduct of fishing operations and biological experiments at any time for purposes of scientific investigation; or

(2) discharging any other duties prescribed by the South Pacific Fishery Resources Convention.

(d) **STATE JURISDICTION NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to diminish or to increase the jurisdiction of any State in the territorial sea of the United States.

SEC. 208. TERRITORIAL PARTICIPATION.

The Secretary of State shall ensure participation in the Commission and its subsidiary bodies by American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to the extent allowed under United States law.

SEC. 209. EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE NOTIFICATION.

Masters of commercial fishing vessels of countries fishing under the management authority of the South Pacific Fisheries Convention that do not carry vessel monitoring systems capable of communicating with United States enforcement authorities shall, before or as soon as reasonably possible after, entering and transiting the exclusive economic zone bounded by the Convention Area, ensure that all fishing gear on board the vessel is stowed below deck or otherwise removed from the place it is normally used for fishing activities and placed where it is not readily available for fishing activities.

TITLE III—WESTERN AND CENTRAL PACIFIC FISHERIES COMMISSION

SEC. 301. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AGENDA OF ANNUAL MEETINGS OF WESTERN AND CENTRAL PACIFIC FISHERIES COMMISSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act is amended—

(1) in section 503 (16 U.S.C. 6902)—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “and commercial fishing” after “fish stocks”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) **AGENDA RECOMMENDATIONS.**—No later than 30 days before each annual meeting of the Commission, the Advisory Committee shall transmit to the United States Commissioners recommendations relating to the agenda of the annual meeting. The recommendations must be agreed to by a majority of the Advisory Committee members. The United States Commissioners shall consider such recommendations, along with additional views transmitted by Advisory Committee members, in the formulation of the United States position for the Commission meeting and during the negotiations at that meeting.”; and

(2) by redesignating section 511 (16 U.S.C. 6910) as section 512, and inserting after section 510 the following:

“SEC. 511. UNITED STATES CONSERVATION, MANAGEMENT, AND ENFORCEMENT OBJECTIVES.

“The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, in the course of negotiations, shall seek to—

“(1) minimize any disadvantage to United States fishermen in relation to other members of the Commission;

“(2) maximize the opportunities for fishing vessels of the United States to harvest fish stocks on the high seas in the Convention area,

recognizing that such harvests may be restricted if the Commission, based on the best available scientific information provided by the Scientific Committee, determines it is necessary to achieve the conservation objective set forth in Article 2 of the Convention;

“(3) prevent any requirement for the transfer to other nations or foreign entities of the fishing capacity, fishing capacity rights, or fishing vessels of the United States or its territories, unless any such requirement is voluntary and market-based; and

“(4) ensure that conservation and management measures take into consideration traditional fishing patterns of fishing vessels of the United States and the operating requirements of the fisheries covered by the Western and Central Pacific Convention.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 is amended in the table of contents by striking the item relating to section 511 (121 Stat. 3576) and inserting the following:

“Sec. 511. United States conservation, management, and enforcement objectives.

“Sec. 512. Authorization of appropriations.”.

TITLE IV—ILLEGAL, UNREGULATED, AND UNREPORTED FISHING

SEC. 401. AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGH SEAS DRIFTNET FISHING MORATORIUM PROTECTION ACT.

(a) **APPLICATION OF ACT.**—Section 606(b) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826g(b)) is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (7), striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(9) the Ensuring Access to Pacific Fisheries Act.”.

(b) **BIENNIAL REPORTS.**—Section 607 of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826h) is amended by inserting “on June 1 of that year” after “every 2 years thereafter.”.

(c) **IDENTIFICATION OF VESSELS.**—Section 609(a) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826j(a)) is amended by striking “fishing vessels of that nation are engaged, or have” and inserting “any fishing vessel of that nation is engaged, or has”.

(d) **IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONS.**—Section 610(a)(2)(A) of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826k) is amended by striking “calendar year” and inserting “3 years”.

TITLE V—NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION AMENDMENTS ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION ACT OF 1995.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the “Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Amendments Act”.

(b) **REFERENCES TO THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION ACT OF 1995.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.).

SEC. 502. REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER CONVENTION.

Section 202 (16 U.S.C. 5601) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “General Council and the Fisheries”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “at a meeting of the General Council or the Fisheries Commission”;

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “, at any meeting of the General Council or the Fisheries Commission for which the Alternate Commissioner is designated”;

(4) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “at a meeting of the Scientific Council”;

(5) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “, at any meeting of the Scientific Council for which the Alternate Representative is designated”; and

(6) in subsection (f)(1)(A), by striking “Magnuson Act” and inserting “Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act”.

SEC. 503. REQUESTS FOR SCIENTIFIC ADVICE.

Section 203 (16 U.S.C. 5602) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “The Representatives may” and inserting “A Representative may”;

(B) by striking “described in subsection (b)(1) or (2)” and inserting “described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b)”;

(C) by striking “the Representatives have” and inserting “the Representative has”;

(2) by striking “VII(1)” each place it appears and inserting “VII(10)(b)”;

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “VIII(2)” and inserting “VII(11)”.

SEC. 504. AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY OF STATE WITH RESPECT TO CONVENTION.

Section 204 (16 U.S.C. 5603) is amended by striking “Fisheries Commission” each place it appears and inserting “Commission consistent with the procedures detailed in Articles XIV and XV of the Convention”.

SEC. 505. INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.

Section 205(a) (16 U.S.C. 5604(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY.**—In carrying out the provisions of the Convention and this title, the Secretary may arrange for cooperation with—

“(1) any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States;

“(2) a State;

“(3) a Council; or

“(4) a private institution or an organization.”.

SEC. 506. PROHIBITED ACTS AND PENALTIES.

Section 207(a)(5) (16 U.S.C. 5606(a)(5)) is amended by striking “fish” and inserting “fishery resources”.

SEC. 507. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.

Section 208 (16 U.S.C. 5607) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “two” and inserting “2”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “General Council or the Fisheries” each place it appears.

SEC. 508. DEFINITIONS.

Section 210 (16 U.S.C. 5609) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 210. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **1982 CONVENTION.**—The term ‘1982 Convention’ means the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982.

“(2) **AUTHORIZED ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term ‘authorized enforcement officer’ means a person authorized to enforce this title, any regulation issued under this title, or any measure that is legally binding on the United States under the Convention.

“(3) **COMMISSION.**—The term ‘Commission’ means the body provided for by Articles V, VI, XIII, XIV, and XV of the Convention.

“(4) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term ‘Commissioner’ means a United States Commissioner to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization appointed under section 202.

“(5) **CONVENTION.**—The term ‘Convention’ means the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, done at Ottawa on October 24, 1978, and as amended on September 28, 2007.

“(6) **CONVENTION AREA.**—The term ‘Convention Area’ means the waters of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean north of 35°00’ N and west of a line extending due north from 35°00’ N and 42°00’ W to 59°00’ N, thence due west to 44°00’ W, and thence due north to the coast of Greenland, and the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Davis Strait and Baffin Bay south of 78°10’ N.

“(7) **COUNCIL.**—The term ‘Council’ means the New England Fishery Management Council or the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

“(8) FISHERY RESOURCES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘fishery resources’ means all fish, mollusks, and crustaceans, including any products thereof, within the Convention Area.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘fishery resources’ does not include—

“(i) sedentary species over which coastal States may exercise sovereign rights consistent with Article 77 of the 1982 Convention; or

“(ii) in so far as they are managed under other international treaties, anadromous and catadromous stocks and highly migratory species listed in Annex I of the 1982 Convention.

“(9) FISHING ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘fishing activities’ means harvesting or processing fishery resources, or transshipping of fishery resources or products derived from fishery resources, or any other activity in preparation for, in support of, or related to the harvesting of fishery resources.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘fishing activities’ includes—

“(i) the actual or attempted searching for or catching or taking of fishery resources;

“(ii) any activity that can reasonably be expected to result in locating, catching, taking, or harvesting of fishery resources for any purpose; and

“(iii) any operation at sea in support of, or in preparation for, any activity described in this paragraph.

“(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘fishing activities’ does not include any operation related to emergencies involving the health and safety of crew members or the safety of a vessel.

“(10) FISHING VESSEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘fishing vessel’ means a vessel that is or has been engaged in fishing activities.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘fishing vessel’ includes a fish processing vessel or a vessel engaged in transshipment or any other activity in preparation for or related to fishing activities, or in experimental or exploratory fishing activities.

“(11) ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘Organization’ means the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization provided for by Article V of the Convention.

“(12) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ means any individual (whether or not a citizen or national of the United States), and any corporation, partnership, association, or other entity (whether or not organized or existing under the laws of any State).

“(13) REPRESENTATIVE.—The term ‘Representative’ means a United States Representative to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Scientific Council appointed under section 202.

“(14) SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL.—The term ‘Scientific Council’ means the Scientific Council provided for by Articles V, VI, and VII of the Convention.

“(15) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Commerce.

“(16) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

“(17) TRANSSHIPMENT.—The term ‘transshipment’ means the unloading of all or any of the fishery resources on board a fishing vessel to another fishing vessel either at sea or in port.”.

SEC. 509. QUOTA ALLOCATION PRACTICE.

Section 213 (16 U.S.C. 5612) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in American Samoa, there are no issues that carry more weight to the people who I represent than those of our fisheries, which comprise over 80 percent of the island's revenue generation. It is for that reason I introduced the Ensuring Access to Pacific Fisheries Act with my colleague from Alaska, Congressman DON YOUNG.

Our bill ensures that our fishermen can operate on a level playing field with foreign nation vessels. Specifically, the bill implements U.S. participation in two new international fishery management agreements to which the United States helped negotiate: the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean and the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean. The bill also includes the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act which was adopted from the Senate bill, among other provisions.

I am proud to say that this bill does exactly what the title suggests. It ensures our fishermen's access to fisheries in international waters where we set the example for the rest of the world on how to best manage and conserve the ocean's resources.

Based on the administration's proposal, this bill makes necessary additions to ensure that our fishermen are properly represented in these international forums. Specifically, the first two titles of this bill ensure participation of the relevant regional fishery management councils and territories in the international negotiations of the North and South Pacific Commissions.

However, it is the third title of this bill that matters most to the people of American Samoa and our other fishing communities. Title III makes critical amendments to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act to minimize the disadvantage and maximize opportunities for our fishing fleets, especially those targeting migratory tuna stocks in the Pacific, which are essential to the stability of the American Samoa economy.

Our committee heard firsthand during the hearing on this bill last March that science has taken a back seat to geopolitics in these negotiations, and our fishermen are bearing the burden, especially those in the area of fishing for bigeye tuna.

In an effort to remain fair and true to the fishermen in American Samoa, title III also ensures access to traditional fishing grounds, which our peo-

ple have utilized for centuries and long before any relationship with the United States, by requiring such grounds to be considered in any formal stance taken by United States commissioners at the WCPFC.

These are necessary measures due to the pressures facing the industry from all sides, from the closing off of large swaths of the ocean, which the American Samoan people have utilized for centuries, to irresponsible federally mandated wage hikes which aim to put our remote and economically isolated islands on the same level as the States.

□ 1630

It is clear that we must ensure that those who are negotiating on behalf of our interests are doing just that, if we are to have any sort of viable fishing industry at all.

I want to thank the minority side for working with us in a bipartisan fashion on this bill. Their input and suggestions were very helpful in crafting this bill and allowing it to pass by unanimous consent. I would also like to thank the executive directors of the North Pacific and Western Pacific Councils for working with us as well. It is always helpful when drafting a bill to make sure that those affected by it have some input in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman KEVIN BRADY of the Ways and Means Committee for agreeing to help expedite consideration of this bill today. This bill, particularly title III, is of the utmost importance to the people of American Samoa.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, August 3, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 13, 2016, the Committee on Natural Resources favorably reported as amended H.R. 4576, the Ensuring Access to Pacific Fisheries Act, by unanimous consent. My staff has shared the reported text of the bill with your staff.

The reported bill contains provisions regarding fishery exports and imports, a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. I ask that the Committee on Ways and Means not seek a sequential referral of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader when the House returns from the August District Work Period. This concession in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Ways and Means represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the Congressional Record to document this agreement.

Thank you for your consideration of my request, and I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, August 3, 2016.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4576, the "Ensuring Access to Pacific Fisheries Act." As you note, the bill contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I appreciate your willingness to work with my Committee on this legislation. In order to allow H.R. 4576 to move expeditiously to the House floor, I will not seek a sequential referral on this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing formal consideration of H.R. 4576, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill implements two important fisheries treaties: the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean and the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the South Pacific Ocean. These treaties cover bottom- and mid-water fisheries in the Pacific Ocean's international waters, and implementing them will give the United States a seat at the table to ensure access for our fishermen and sound management of the resource.

H.R. 4576 also updates the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act and amends the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Act, and makes important changes to the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act. This set of changes will enhance our ability to combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing and give greater protection to sharks.

I applaud the efforts of the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) to bring this bill to the floor in its current form.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) that the

House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4576, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZING THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 295) to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 295

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM REAUTHORIZED.

Section 507(d)(2) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (54 U.S.C. 302101 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting "and each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 295, introduced by Congressman CLYBURN of South Carolina, reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program. Since 1988, this program has allowed historically Black colleges and universities to document, preserve, and stabilize historic structures on their campuses. Over \$60 million has been awarded to these colleges and universities for this program, ensuring that their rich history remains preserved for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this important measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 295, my bill to reau-

thorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program. This bill has been cosponsored by my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and is broadly supported by all of our colleagues. It received a unanimous vote in the House Natural Resources Committee earlier this year, and I thank Mrs. RADEWAGEN and Mr. SABLAN and all of our colleagues for their support.

As a former high school history teacher, I have worked during my tenure in Congress to preserve and protect our Nation's historic treasures. Historically Black colleges and universities, commonly called HBCUs, are some of the most important historic educational institutions in our country. Many of them have buildings and sites on their campuses that have existed for over a century. Unfortunately, many of the historic buildings and sites on these campuses have deteriorated over the years and are at risk of being lost completely if not preserved and protected.

In 1998, at the request of the Congressional Black Caucus, the United States Government Accountability Office surveyed 103 HBCU campuses to identify the historically significant sites on these campuses and project the cost of restoring and preserving these properties. The GAO identified 712 historic buildings and sites and projected a cost of \$755 million to restore and preserve them. Each of these sites has national significance to American history, and I believe we have an obligation to be stewards of these cultural treasures.

Congress first authorized grants to HBCUs for historic preservation in 1996. In 2003, working with our former colleague, the gentleman from Utah, Jim Hansen, and our current colleague, and my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY DUNCAN, Congress expanded the program that was originally championed by our former colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Bob Clement. Ten million dollars was authorized annually for 5 years.

The bill before us today extends that authorization at the same level for an additional 7 years. I have seen the transformative effect of these historic preservation grants on HBCU campuses in my district and across the country.

Arnette Hall at Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, was designed by an African American architect and constructed by the university students themselves in 1891. Before being restored to the Secretary of the Interior's standards, Arnette Hall had been boarded up for nearly 40 years.

Testifying before the Committee on Natural Resources earlier this year, Claflin University's president, Dr. Henry Tisdale, spoke of the tremendous impact the restorations of Ministers and Tingley Halls have had on his institution.

Last June, I spoke at the rededication of historic Chappelle Auditorium, on the campus of Allen University, which was painstakingly restored thanks to funding from this program.

Originally built in 1925, this building was central to the cultural life of African Americans in South Carolina for generations.

In 1947, Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine attended a NAACP event at Chappelle Auditorium that inspired him to organize Black families in Clarendon County to petition their school district to provide buses for Black students who, at the time, were forced to make a daily walk of 9.4 miles to school. This case, *Briggs v. Elliot*, precipitated the frontal attack on segregation in the country and was later combined with four other cases that became *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, at the United States Supreme Court. Overturning the "separate but equal" fallacy, *Brown* ended legal segregation in this country.

Historic buildings and sites at 59 HBCUs in 20 States have benefited from this program. Their stories are similar to those in my district that I have just shared.

There are many more buildings and sites on these campuses that are in dire need of restoration and preservation. H.R. 295 will renew our commitment to the stewardship of this critical aspect of American history.

Although it will not provide all of the funding the GAO estimated is needed to preserve every threatened site, H.R. 295 will continue the progress Congress has made in preserving these unique treasures.

I thank Chairman BISHOP, subcommittee Chairman McCLINTOCK, and Ranking Members GRIJALVA and TSONGAS for their support of this important legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman that I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 295 is a great bill. I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), my esteemed colleague, for all of his hard work.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 295, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALYCE SPOTTED BEAR AND WALTER SOBOLEFF COMMISSION ON NATIVE CHILDREN ACT

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (S. 246) to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 246

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children established by section 3.

(2) INDIAN.—The term "Indian" has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term "Indian tribe" has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) NATIVE CHILD.—The term "Native child" means—

(A) an Indian child, as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1903);

(B) an Indian who is between the ages of 18 and 24 years old; and

(C) a Native Hawaiian who is not older than 24 years old.

(5) NATIVE HAWAIIAN.—The term "Native Hawaiian" has the meaning given the term in section 7207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term "Tribal College or University" has the meaning given the term in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).

SEC. 3. COMMISSION ON NATIVE CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission in the Office of Tribal Justice of the Department of Justice, to be known as the "Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children".

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members, of whom—

(A) 3 shall be appointed by the President, in consultation with—

(i) the Attorney General;

(ii) the Secretary;

(iii) the Secretary of Education; and

(iv) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(B) 3 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate;

(C) 1 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Vice Chairperson of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate;

(D) 3 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(E) 1 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each member of the Commission shall have significant experience and expertise in—

(i) Indian affairs; and

(ii) matters to be studied by the Commission, including—

(I) health care issues facing Native children, including mental health, physical health, and nutrition;

(II) Indian education, including experience with Bureau of Indian Education schools and public schools, tribally operated schools, tribal colleges or universities, early childhood education programs, and the development of extracurricular programs;

(III) juvenile justice programs relating to prevention and reducing incarceration and rates of recidivism; and

(IV) social service programs that are used by Native children and designed to address basic needs, such as food, shelter, and safety, including child protective services, group homes, and shelters.

(B) EXPERTS.—

(i) NATIVE CHILDREN.—1 member of the Commission shall—

(I) meet the requirements of subparagraph (A); and

(II) be responsible for providing the Commission with insight into and input from Native children on the matters studied by the Commission.

(ii) RESEARCH.—1 member of the Commission shall—

(I) meet the requirements of subparagraph (A); and

(II) have extensive experience in statistics or social science research.

(3) TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) OPERATION.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall select 1 member to serve as Chairperson of the Commission.

(2) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(B) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the Commission shall take place not later than 30 days after the date described in paragraph (1).

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(4) RULES.—The Commission may establish, by majority vote, any rules for the conduct of Commission business, in accordance with this Act and other applicable law.

(d) NATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commission shall establish a committee, to be known as the "Native Advisory Committee".

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Native Advisory Committee shall consist of—

(i) 1 representative of Indian tribes from each region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs who is 25 years of age or older; and

(ii) 1 Native Hawaiian who is 25 years of age or older.

(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—Each member of the Native Advisory Committee shall have experience relating to matters to be studied by the Commission.

(3) DUTIES.—The Native Advisory Committee shall—

(A) serve as an advisory body to the Commission; and

(B) provide to the Commission advice and recommendations, submit materials, documents, testimony, and such other information as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission under this section.

(4) NATIVE CHILDREN SUBCOMMITTEE.—The Native Advisory Committee shall establish a subcommittee that shall consist of at least 1 member

from each region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and 1 Native Hawaiian, each of whom shall be a Native child, and have experience serving on the council of a tribal, regional, or national youth organization.

(e) **COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF NATIVE CHILDREN ISSUES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of Federal, State, local, and tribal programs that serve Native children, including an evaluation of—

(A) the impact of concurrent jurisdiction on child welfare systems;

(B) the barriers Indian tribes and Native Hawaiians face in applying, reporting on, and using existing public and private grant resources, including identification of any Federal cost-sharing requirements;

(C) the obstacles to nongovernmental financial support, such as from private foundations and corporate charities, for programs benefiting Native children;

(D) the issues relating to data collection, such as small sample sizes, large margins of error, or other issues related to the validity and statistical significance of data on Native children;

(E) the barriers to the development of sustainable, multidisciplinary programs designed to assist high-risk Native children and families of those high-risk Native children;

(F) cultural or socioeconomic challenges in communities of Native children;

(G) any examples of successful program models and use of best practices in programs that serve children and families;

(H) the barriers to interagency coordination on programs benefiting Native children; and

(I) the use of memoranda of agreement or interagency agreements to facilitate or improve agency coordination, including the effects of existing memoranda or interagency agreements on program service delivery and efficiency.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Commission shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) to avoid duplication of efforts, collaborate with other workgroups focused on similar issues, such as the Task Force on American Indian/Alaska Native Children Exposed to Violence of the Attorney General; and

(B) to improve coordination and reduce travel costs, use available technology.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Taking into consideration the results of the study under paragraph (1) and the analysis of any existing data relating to Native children received from Federal agencies, the Commission shall—

(A) develop recommendations for goals, and plans for achieving those goals, for Federal policy relating to Native children in the short-, mid-, and long-term, which shall be informed by the development of accurate child well-being measures, except that the Commission shall not consider or recommend the recognition or the establishment of a government-to-government relationship with—

(i) any entity not recognized on or before the date of enactment of this Act by the Federal Government through an Act of Congress, Executive action, judicial decree, or any other action; or

(ii) any entity not included in the list authorized pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a et seq.);

(B) make recommendations on necessary modifications and improvements to programs that serve Native children at the Federal, State, and tribal levels, on the condition that the recommendations recognize the diversity in cultural values, integrate the cultural strengths of the communities of the Native children, and will result in—

(i) improvements to the child welfare system that—

(I) reduce the disproportionate rate at which Native children enter child protective services and the period of time spent in the foster system;

(II) increase coordination among social workers, police, and foster families assisting Native children while in the foster system to result in the increased safety of Native children while in the foster system;

(III) encourage the hiring and retention of licensed social workers in Native communities;

(IV) address the lack of available foster homes in Native communities; and

(V) reduce truancy and improve the academic proficiency and graduation rates of Native children in the foster system;

(ii) improvements to the mental and physical health of Native children, taking into consideration the rates of suicide, substance abuse, and access to nutrition and health care, including—

(I) an analysis of the increased access of Native children to Medicaid under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the effect of that increase on the ability of Indian tribes and Native Hawaiians to develop sustainable health programs; and

(II) an evaluation of the effects of a lack of public sanitation infrastructure, including in-home sewer and water, on the health status of Native children;

(iii) improvements to educational and vocational opportunities for Native children that will lead to—

(I) increased school attendance, performance, and graduation rates for Native children across all educational levels, including early education, post-secondary, and graduate school;

(II) localized strategies developed by educators, tribal and community leaders, and law enforcement to prevent and reduce truancy among Native children;

(III) scholarship opportunities at a Tribal College or University and other public and private postsecondary institutions;

(IV) increased participation of the immediate families of Native children;

(V) coordination among schools and Indian tribes that serve Native children, including in the areas of data sharing and student tracking;

(VI) accurate identification of students as Native children; and

(VII) increased school counseling services, improved access to quality nutrition at school, and safe student transportation;

(iv) improved policies and practices by local school districts that would result in improved academic proficiency for Native children;

(v) increased access to extracurricular activities for Native children that are designed to increase self-esteem, promote community engagement, and support academic excellence while also serving to prevent unplanned pregnancy, membership in gangs, drug and alcohol abuse, and suicide, including activities that incorporate traditional language and cultural practices of Indians and Native Hawaiians;

(vi) taking into consideration the report of the Indian Law and Order Commission issued pursuant to section 15(f) of the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act (25 U.S.C. 2812(f)), improvements to Federal, State, and tribal juvenile justice systems and detention programs—

(I) to provide greater access to educational opportunities and social services for incarcerated Native children;

(II) to promote prevention and reduce incarceration and recidivism rates among Native children;

(III) to identify intervention approaches and alternatives to incarceration of Native children;

(IV) to incorporate families and the traditional cultures of Indians and Native Hawaiians in the juvenile justice process, including through the development of a family court for juvenile offenses; and

(V) to prevent unnecessary detentions and identify successful reentry programs;

(vii) expanded access to a continuum of early development and learning services for Native children from prenatal to age 5 that are culturally competent, support Native language preservation, and comprehensively promote the

health, well-being, learning, and development of Native children, such as—

(I) high quality early care and learning programs for children starting from birth, including Early Head Start, Head Start, child care, and preschool programs;

(II) programs, including home visiting and family resource and support programs, that increase the capacity of parents to support the learning and development of the children of the parents, beginning prenatally, and connect the parents with necessary resources;

(III) early intervention and preschool services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-aged children with developmental delays or disabilities; and

(IV) professional development opportunities for Native providers of early development and learning services;

(viii) the development of a system that delivers wrap-around services to Native children in a way that is comprehensive and sustainable, including through increased coordination among Indian tribes, schools, law enforcement, health care providers, social workers, and families;

(ix) more flexible use of existing Federal programs, such as by—

(I) providing Indians and Native Hawaiians with more flexibility to carry out programs, while maintaining accountability, minimizing administrative time, cost, and expense and reducing the burden of Federal paperwork requirements; and

(II) allowing unexpended Federal funds to be used flexibly to support programs benefiting Native children, while taking into account—

(aa) the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3401 note; 106 Stat. 2302);

(bb) the Coordinated Tribal Assistance Solicitation program of the Department of Justice;

(cc) the Federal policy of self-determination; and

(dd) any consolidated grant programs; and

(x) solutions to other issues that, as determined by the Commission, would improve the health, safety, and well-being of Native children;

(C) make recommendations for improving data collection methods that consider—

(i) the adoption of standard definitions and compatible systems platforms to allow for greater linkage of data sets across Federal agencies;

(ii) the appropriateness of existing data categories for comparative purposes;

(iii) the development of quality data and measures, such as by ensuring sufficient sample sizes and frequency of sampling, for Federal, State, and tribal programs that serve Native children;

(iv) the collection and measurement of data that are useful to Indian tribes and Native Hawaiians;

(v) the inclusion of Native children in longitudinal studies; and

(vi) tribal access to data gathered by Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; and

(D) identify models of successful Federal, State, and tribal programs in the areas studied by the Commission.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which all members of the Commission are appointed and amounts are made available to carry out this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report that contains—

(1) a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission; and

(2) the recommendations of the Commission for such legislative and administrative actions as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(g) **POWERS.**—

(1) **HEARINGS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may hold such hearings, meet and act at such times and

places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers to be advisable to carry out the duties of the Commission under this section, except that the Commission shall hold not less than 5 hearings in Native communities.

(B) **PUBLIC REQUIREMENT.**—The hearings of the Commission under this paragraph shall be open to the public.

(2) **WITNESS EXPENSES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A witness requested to appear before the Commission shall be paid the same fees and allowances as are paid to witnesses under section 1821 of title 28, United States Code.

(B) **PER DIEM AND MILEAGE.**—The fees and allowances for a witness shall be paid from funds made available to the Commission.

(3) **INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL, TRIBAL, AND STATE AGENCIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may secure directly from a Federal agency such information as the Commission considers to be necessary to carry out this section.

(B) **TRIBAL AND STATE AGENCIES.**—The Commission may request the head of any tribal or State agency to provide to the Commission such information as the Commission considers to be necessary to carry out this Act.

(4) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(5) **GIFTS.**—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property related to the purpose of the Commission.

(h) **COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.**—

(1) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—A member of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(2) **DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—On the affirmative vote of 2/3 of the members of the Commission—

(i) the Attorney General, the Secretary, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of the Health and Human Services shall each detail, without reimbursement, 1 or more employees of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(ii) with the approval of the appropriate Federal agency head, an employee of any other Federal agency may be, without reimbursement, detailed to the Commission.

(B) **EFFECT ON DETAIL EES.**—Detail under this paragraph shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status, benefits, or privileges.

(3) **PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—On request of the Commission, the Attorney General shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, reasonable and appropriate office space, supplies, and administrative assistance.

(B) **NO REQUIREMENT FOR PHYSICAL FACILITIES.**—The Administrator of General Services shall not be required to locate a permanent, physical office space for the operation of the Commission.

(4) **MEMBERS NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—No member of the Commission, the Native Advisory Committee, or the Native Children Subcommittee shall be considered to be a Federal employee.

(i) **TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.**—The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits the report under subsection (f).

(j) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission, the Native Advisory Committee, or the Native Children Subcommittee.

(k) **EFFECT.**—This Act shall not be construed to recognize or establish a government-to-government relationship with—

(1) any entity not recognized on or before the date of enactment of this Act by the Federal Government through an Act of Congress, Executive action, judicial decree, or any other action; or

(2) any entity not included in the list authorized pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of S. 246, the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act. This bill would establish a commission in the Office of Tribal Justice at the Department of Justice. The commission would be composed of 11 members appointed by the President and congressional leadership. Each commissioner would be required to have significant expertise in Indian affairs, healthcare issues facing Native children, Indian education, juvenile justice programs focused on reducing incarceration and recidivism, and social services programs used by Native children.

□ 1645

The commission would report to Congress and to the President with legislative and administrative recommendations for improving support for mental and physical health and increased educational opportunities for Native children.

Protecting Native children and providing safe and supportive communities has always been a top priority identified by tribal leaders, yet the lack of sufficient coordinated research on the full scope of the causes, existing issues, and challenges inhibits the Federal and tribal governments from developing appropriate tailored programs to deliver the most efficient and targeted services to Native children.

S. 246 is a companion bill to H.R. 2751, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM). I urge adoption of S. 246.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The studies indicate that Native youth experience significantly more

challenges in virtually every aspect of their development from birth to adolescence than any other population. Native infants experience higher infant mortality rates than those of other racial or ethnic groups. Native children are overrepresented in foster care, at more than 2.1 times the general population, and 37 percent of Native children live in poverty.

Finally, it is most troubling that Native youth face a higher risk and rate of premature death than other youth. In fact, suicide is the second leading cause of death, 2.5 times the national rate, for Native youth in the 15 to 24 age group.

We need to take a comprehensive look at the health and well-being of Native children and to find the root causes of and real solutions to the problems and issues that are leading to these disturbing trends. This is why I wholeheartedly support S. 246 and the establishment of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children.

The commission will be comprised of experts in the areas of juvenile justice, social work, education, and mental and physical health, working alongside a Native advisory committee composed of Native tribal representatives. They will conduct a comprehensive study of current Federal and local programs, grants, and support available for Native communities and children, and will report our recommendations for legislative and administrative actions and modifications and improvements to better serve our Native children.

I want to thank Senator HEITKAMP for introducing this important legislation and for tirelessly advocating for the creation of this commission. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for championing the House version of the bill, H.R. 2751.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children will be successful in its endeavor, and I encourage my colleagues to swiftly adopt this legislation. Native children cannot wait any longer.

I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 246, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIVE AMERICAN TOURISM AND IMPROVING VISITOR EXPERIENCE ACT

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (S. 1579) to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1579

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act” or the “NATIVE Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to enhance and integrate Native American tourism—

(A) to empower Native American communities; and

(B) to advance the National Travel and Tourism Strategy;

(2) to increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets to support Native American tourism and bolster recreational travel and tourism;

(3) to expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States to spur economic development, create jobs, and increase tourism revenues;

(4) to enhance and improve self-determination and self-governance capabilities in the Native American community and to promote greater self-sufficiency;

(5) to encourage Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to engage more fully in Native American tourism activities to increase visitation to rural and remote areas in the United States that are too difficult to access or are unknown to domestic travelers and international tourists;

(6) to provide grants, loans, and technical assistance to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations that will—

(A) spur important infrastructure development;

(B) increase tourism capacity; and

(C) elevate living standards in Native American communities; and

(7) to support the development of technologically innovative projects that will incorporate recreational travel and tourism information and data from Federal assets to improve the visitor experience.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) NATIVE HAWAIIAN ORGANIZATION.—The term “Native Hawaiian organization” means a nonprofit organization—

(A) that serves the interests of Native Hawaiians;

(B) in which Native Hawaiians serve in substantive and policymaking positions; and

(C) that is recognized for having expertise in Native Hawaiian culture and heritage, including tourism.

(4) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term “tribal organization” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 4. INTEGRATING FEDERAL TOURISM ASSETS TO STRENGTHEN NATIVE TOURISM OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior shall update the respective management plans and tourism initiatives of the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior to include Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations.

(b) OTHER AGENCIES.—The head of each agency that has recreational travel or tourism functions or complementary programs shall update the respective management plans and tourism strategies of the agency to include Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations.

(c) NATIVE AMERICAN TOURISM PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The plans shall outline policy proposals—

(A) to improve travel and tourism data collection and analysis;

(B) to increase the integration, alignment, and utility of public records, publications, and Web sites maintained by Federal agencies;

(C) to create a better user experience for domestic travelers and international visitors;

(D) to align Federal agency Web sites and publications;

(E) to support national tourism goals;

(F) to identify agency programs that could be used to support tourism capacity building and help sustain tourism infrastructure in Native American communities;

(G) to develop innovative visitor portals for parks, landmarks, heritage and cultural sites, and assets that showcase and respect the diversity of the indigenous peoples of the United States;

(H) to share local Native American heritage through the development of bilingual interpretive and directional signage that could include or incorporate English and the local Native American language or languages; and

(I) to improve access to transportation programs related to Native American community capacity building for tourism and trade, including transportation planning for programs related to visitor enhancement and safety.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES AND NATIVE AMERICANS.—In developing the plan under paragraph (1), the head of each agency shall consult with Indian tribes and the Native American community to identify appropriate levels of inclusion of the Indian tribes and Native Americans in Federal tourism activities, public records and publications, including Native American tourism information available on Web sites.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall enter into a memorandum of understanding or cooperative agreement with an entity or organization with a demonstrated record in tribal communities of defining, introducing, developing, and sustaining American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian tourism and related activities in a manner that respects and honors native traditions and values.

(2) COORDINATION.—The memorandum of understanding or cooperative agreement described in paragraph (1) shall formalize a role for the organization or entity to serve as a facilitator between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce and the Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations—

(A) to identify areas where technical assistance is needed through consultations with Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to empower

the Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to participate fully in the tourism industry; and

(B) to provide a means for the delivery of technical assistance and coordinate the delivery of the assistance to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations in collaboration with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and other entities with distinctive experience, as appropriate.

(3) FUNDING.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the head of each Federal agency, including the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Labor shall obligate any funds made available to the head of the agency to cover any administrative expenses incurred by the organization or entity described in paragraph (1) in carrying out programs or activities of the agency.

(4) METRICS.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall coordinate with the organization or entity described in paragraph (1) to develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the entity or organization in strengthening tourism opportunities for Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations.

(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and occasionally thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall each submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the manner in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as applicable, is including Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations in management plans;

(2) the efforts of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as applicable, to develop departmental and agency tourism plans to support tourism programs of Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations;

(3) the manner in which the entity or organization described in subsection (d)(1) is working to promote tourism to empower Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to participate fully in the tourism industry; and

(4) the effectiveness of the entity or organization described in subsection (d)(1) based on the metrics developed under subsection (d)(4).

SEC. 5. NATIVE AMERICAN TOURISM AND BRANDING ENHANCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall—

(1) take actions that help empower Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to showcase the heritage, foods, traditions, history, and continuing vitality of Native American communities;

(2) support the efforts of Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations—

(A) to identify and enhance or maintain traditions and cultural features that are important to sustain the distinctiveness of the local Native American community; and

(B) to provide visitor experiences that are authentic and respectful;

(3) provide assistance to interpret the connections between the indigenous peoples of the United States and the national identity of the United States;

(4) enhance efforts to promote understanding and respect for diverse cultures and

subcultures in the United States and the relevance of those cultures to the national brand of the United States; and

(5) enter into appropriate memoranda of understanding and establish public-private partnerships to ensure that arriving domestic travelers at airports and arriving international visitors at ports of entry are welcomed in a manner that both showcases and respects the diversity of Native American communities.

(b) GRANTS.—To the extent practicable, grant programs relating to travel, recreation, or tourism administered by the Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, or the head of an agency with assets or resources relating to travel, recreation, or tourism promotion or branding enhancement for which Indian tribes, tribal organizations, or Native Hawaiian organizations are eligible may be used—

(1) to support the efforts of Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to tell the story of Native Americans as the First Peoples of the United States;

(2) to use the arts and humanities to help revitalize Native communities, promote economic development, increase livability, and present the uniqueness of the United States to visitors in a way that celebrates the diversity of the United States; and

(3) to carry out this section.

(c) SMITHSONIAN.—The Advisory Council and the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall work with Indian tribes, tribal organizations, Native Hawaiian organizations, and nonprofit organizations to establish long-term partnerships with non-Smithsonian museums and educational and cultural organizations—

(1) to share collections, exhibitions, interpretive materials, and educational strategies; and

(2) to conduct joint research and collaborative projects that would support tourism efforts for Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations and carry out the intent of this section.

SEC. 6. EFFECT.

Nothing in this Act alters, or demonstrates congressional support for the alteration of, the legal relationship between the United States and any American Indian, Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian individual, group, organization, or entity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from American Samoa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1579, the Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act, commonly known as the NATIVE

Act. This bill would require Federal agencies with recreational travel and tourism functions to include Indian tribes and tribal organization in management plans. Furthermore, the bill requires the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior to report on how each Department is including tribes to develop Native American tourism plans to improve travel and tourism data collection.

The U.S. Travel Association estimates that the tourism industry in the United States topped \$220 billion in 2014. According to the American Indian Alaska Native Tourism Association, there is growing interest in Indian Country as a tourist attraction.

This bill would help strengthen coordination and collaboration between Federal agencies where tourism programs currently exist without requiring any new appropriations. By removing any silo systems within government, tribes can seek to seize economic opportunities.

S. 1579 is the companion bill to H.R. 3477, sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman MARKWAYNE MULLIN. I want to thank him for his hard work on this legislation.

I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters between the chairman of Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on House Administration regarding this bill, and we thank them for agreeing to help expedite consideration of this bill today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, August 24, 2016.

Hon. CANDICE MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: On July 13, 2016, the Committee on Natural Resources favorably reported S. 1579, Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act, by unanimous consent. This bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration and Energy and Commerce. My staff has forwarded the reported text to your committee for review.

Based on this text, I ask that you allow the Committee on House Administration to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on House Administration be represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration of my request, and I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, August 24, 2016.
Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding S. 1579. As you know, the bill was received in the House of Representatives on June 15, 2015, and referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on House Administration. The bill seeks to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States. On July 13, 2016, your Committee ordered S. 1579 to be reported by unanimous consent.

The Committee on House Administration agrees to discharge from further consideration of S. 1579 to expedite floor consideration. It is the understanding of the Committee on House Administration that foregoing action on S. 1579 will not prejudice the Committee with respect to appointment of conferees or any future jurisdictional claim. I request that your letter and this response be included in the bill report filed by your Committee, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,
CANDICE MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2016.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 13, 2016, the Committee on Natural Resources favorably reported S. 1579, Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act, by unanimous consent. This bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and House Administration. My staff has forwarded the reported text to your committee for review.

Based on this text, I ask that you allow the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce be represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration of my request, and I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,
ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2016.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP: I write in regard to S. 1579, NATIVE Act, which was recently ordered to be reported by the Committee on

Natural Resources. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on S. 1579 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to S. 1579 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of S. 1579, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Like many other communities around the country, tribes and tribal organizations are looking for ways to attract the business of overseas tourists; and there is a significant opportunity for tribes and Native people to share and reinforce their cultures, generate income, create jobs, and improve their quality of life through increased tourism.

According to the Department of Commerce, as my colleague alluded to earlier, tourism was almost a quarter-of-a-trillion-dollar industry in 2014, with almost 34 million overseas travelers visiting the United States. And overseas travelers to the United States who visit national parks or tribal lands tend to stay longer in the United States, visit more destinations within the country, and are more likely to be repeat visitors.

However, there are currently no tourism initiatives at the Federal level that include tribes and tribal organizations. The NATIVE Act would remedy that situation by encouraging Federal programs that support tourism and tourism infrastructure to engage with our Native American communities. This will increase tribal opportunity to showcase the rich and diverse history of the indigenous peoples of the United States.

I commend Senator SCHATZ of Hawaii for this legislation. I ask my colleagues to support S. 1579.

Having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support S. 1579, the Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience (NATIVE) Act. This bill will advance Indian Country tourism by requiring federal agencies with recreational travel and tourism functions to include Indian tribes and tribal organizations in updated management plans and develop Native American tourism.

Anecdotally, we know the foreign tourists have a keen interest in our Indian history and culture. This bill will enable the collection of vital travel and tourism data and analysis and,

importantly, increase integration of federal assets to Indian Country so they can advance their economic development goals and tribal sovereignty.

Indian Country is a mosaic with vibrant cultures and a rich assortment of languages and traditions. By promoting this vast array of authentic Native tourism assets, the United States can increase its ability to compete for international visitors seeking a uniquely American experience while ensuring that diverse Native communities contribute to, and benefit from, the economic benefits that travel affords.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1579.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETTER ON-LINE TICKET SALES ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5104) to prohibit, as an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce, the sale or use of certain software to circumvent control measures used by Internet ticket sellers to ensure equitable consumer access to tickets for any given event, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5104

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Better On-line Ticket Sales Act of 2016" or the "BOTS Act".

SEC. 2. UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES RELATING TO USE OF TICKET ACCESS CIRCUMVENTION SOFTWARE.

(a) *SALE OF SOFTWARE.*—It shall be unlawful for any person to sell or offer to sell, in commerce, any computer software, or part thereof, that—

(1) *is primarily designed or produced for the purpose of circumventing a technological measure that limits purchases made via a computerized event ticketing system;*

(2) *has only limited commercially significant purpose or use other than to circumvent a technological measure that limits purchases made via a computerized event ticketing system;* or

(3) *is marketed by that person for use in circumventing a technological measure that limits purchases made via a computerized event ticketing system.*

(b) *USE OF SOFTWARE.*—It shall be unlawful for any person to use any computer software, or part thereof, described in subsection (a) of this section, to purchase an event ticket via a computerized event ticketing system in violation of the system operator's posted limits on the sequence or number of transactions, frequency of transactions, or quantity of tickets purchased by a single user of the system, or on the geographic location of any transactions.

(c) *RESALE OF TICKETS.*—It shall be unlawful for any person to engage in the practice of reselling in commerce, event tickets acquired in violation of subsection (b) of this section if the person either—

(1) *participated directly in or had the ability to control the conduct in violation of subsection (b); or*

(2) *knew or should have known that the event tickets were acquired in violation of subsection (b).*

(d) *DEFINITIONS.*—As used in this section—

(1) *the term "computerized event ticketing system" means a system of selling event tickets, in commerce, via an online interactive computer system that effectively limits the sequence or number of ticket purchase transactions, frequency of ticket purchase transactions, quantity of tickets purchased, or geographic location of any ticket purchase transactions;*

(2) *the term "event ticket" means a ticket entitling one or more individuals to attend, in person, one or more events to occur on specific dates, times, and geographic locations; and*

(3) *to "circumvent a technological measure" means to avoid, bypass, remove, deactivate, or impair a technological measure, without the authority of the computerized event ticketing system operator.*

(e) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.*—Notwithstanding the prohibitions set forth in subsections (a) and (b), it shall not be unlawful under this section to create or use any computer software, or part thereof, to—

(1) *investigate or further the enforcement or defense of any alleged violation of this section; or*

(2) *engage in research necessary to identify and analyze flaws and vulnerabilities of a computerized event ticketing system, if these research activities are conducted to advance the state of knowledge in the field of computer system security or to assist in the development of computer security products.*

(f) *ENFORCEMENT BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.*—A violation of subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall be treated as an unfair and deceptive act or practice in violation of a regulation issued under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(g) *ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.*—

(1) *AUTHORIZATION.*—Subject to paragraph (2), in any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (c), the attorney general of the State may, as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) *RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.*—

(A) *NOTICE TO FTC.*—

(i) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in clause (iii), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Federal Trade Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under paragraph (1) before initiating the civil action against a person for a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (c).

(ii) *CONTENTS.*—The notification required by clause (i) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(iii) *EXCEPTION.*—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by clause (i) before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(B) *INTERVENTION BY THE FTC.*—The Federal Trade Commission may—

(i) *intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1); and*

(ii) *upon intervening, be heard on all matters arising in the civil action, and file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.*

(3) *PENDING ACTION BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.*—If the Federal Trade Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (c), the attorney general of a State may

not, during the pendency of such action, bring a civil action under paragraph (1) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for the violation with respect to which the Commission instituted such action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of several bipartisan bills that have resulted from the focus on the industries creating the jobs of tomorrow within the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade.

In particular, we examined the Federal Trade Commission's oversight of and impact on innovation. We considered several bills to streamline the Federal Trade Commission's authority in emerging areas. These bills build on the Federal Trade Commission's work in overseeing the most cutting edge industries as well as threats to consumer protection presented, in part, by technological advances.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has a good model for policing unfair and deceptive practices in economic sectors driven by emerging technology. We highlighted this in our Disrupters Series of hearings, focusing on new and game-changing technologies. The Federal Trade Commission operates under a flexible framework, and this session we sought to make improvements.

Before I get into the bills we consider today, I want to highlight H.R. 5510, the Federal Trade Commission Process and Transparency Reform Act, which would strengthen the Federal Trade Commission's model by ensuring it has the right tools, the right restraints, and, of course, transparency.

This legislation is the sum of several measures from a number of members of the subcommittee who each contributed some targeted reforms to ensure that the Federal Trade Commission continues to strike the right balance between mitigating consumer harm and fostering innovative products and services.

The Federal Trade Commission was last reauthorized in 1996, and the last time substantial changes were made to its broad authorities was 1994. A lot has changed in the tech-driven sectors under the Federal Trade Commission's purview since then, and H.R. 5510 would

make small reforms to ensure that Federal law keeps up with the rest of the world.

Two of the four bills from my subcommittee we will consider today clarify the Federal Trade Commission's ability to stop certain practices that have taken advantage of consumers over the Internet.

One of our bills, the BOTS Act, H.R. 5104, is a targeted measure to ensure that consumers have fair access to tickets at reasonable prices. The Internet has created great opportunities for fans to engage with their favorite teams, their favorite performers, and their favorite artists; but ticket bots have detracted from these relationships and, in fact, thwarted the efforts to obtain event tickets at their intended prices. The BOTS Act is necessary to ensure that consumers reap the full benefits of having online access to event tickets. I thank Congresswoman BLACKBURN for her leadership in authoring this bill and pushing it forward through our subcommittee.

Another bill, H.R. 5111, would ensure that online consumer reviews are no longer subject to gag orders. Some bad actors have penalized consumers for giving their products or services a bad review. This is holding back progress and accountability; and our legislation, the Consumer Review Fairness Act, would help put a stop to it. Congressman LANCE is the author of this legislation, and I thank him for his work in making certain that this becomes law.

We also have before us H. Res. 847, a measure that recognizes the potential of the Internet of things. A national strategy is needed for the Internet of things. In order to reap the potentially enormous benefits of connected devices, we must ensure that the bureaucracy stays out of the way of innovation, stays out of the way of progress in the marketplace, but that the government is also using the technology to reduce costs to taxpayers.

Similarly, we are putting forward a resolution authored by Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. CÁRDENAS, H. Res. 835. This measure recognizes the growing importance of advanced financial technology, what they call fintech. Fintech has driven forward the development of blockchain technologies, which are poised to revolutionize several economic sectors.

Blockchain technology may help solve problems related to transaction costs and is especially well suited to address security concerns in cyberspace.

□ 1700

In addition to the four bills from subcommittee, we will also be considering three bills from other subcommittees within Energy and Commerce. The Amateur Radio Parity Act would require the Federal Communications Commission to adopt rules that allow amateur radio operators to use their equipment in deed-restricted communities. The Advanced Nuclear Tech-

nology Development Act would provide certainty for scientists and industry that advance nuclear technologies that can be reviewed, licensed, and commercially deployed, helping the United States remain the world leader in nuclear technology development. Finally, the Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act would ensure doctors traveling with athletic teams across State borders are properly covered by malpractice insurance.

Again, I want to thank all Members of the subcommittee and the full committee who sponsored these measures and the stakeholders who helped us perfect them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this is a bipartisan day where we have a number of pieces of legislation we agreed to. I will talk about each of them, but I do want to say that I am a bit disappointed that my chairman decided to focus on a partisan bill on which there is a good deal of disagreement, H.R. 5510, the FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act. The bill, in the view of the Democrats, would undermine consumer protections at the FTC and it would make it harder for the FTC to take action in the case of noneconomic harm, like privacy violations, such as a 2012 cyber peeping case that we have been talking about. So I am hoping that we can, from now on, focus on bills that we, fortunately, do agree on and move them forward.

I am talking now about H.R. 5104, the Better On-line Ticket Sales Act, the BOTS Act, sponsored by MARSHA BLACKBURN. I thank Representative BLACKBURN for authoring the legislation and Representative TONKO for co-sponsoring that legislation.

The legislation addresses a real problem in the ticket marketplace. Anyone who has tried to buy tickets, let's say, to Adele, Beyonce, or Hamilton knows how difficult it can be to buy online. The Chicago production of Hamilton, I'm sorry to say, sold out almost immediately when tickets were put on sale this summer, and that is not just because everybody was ahead of me online.

Ticket buyers are competing not only against other fans, but in many cases, they are up against sophisticated bots that buy up tickets to resell on the secondary market at a jacked-up price. The BOTS Act empowers the Federal Trade Commission to go after these bots, and I support that.

However, there is more we could do to help consumers in the ticket marketplace. Not only are tickets scooped up by bots, but a significant share of seats is held back for the artist, fan clubs, promotions, and other special groups. There is little transparency about what is actually being put up for general sale.

When you buy a ticket online, the first price you see is often not the price you end up paying. Service and convenience charges can surprise consumers, adding several dollars to the end price.

In subcommittee and full committee, we considered a Democratic amendment based on Congressman PASCRELL's BOSS Act to create more transparency on the price and availability of tickets. This would improve the overall environment for ticket buyers. The committee also considered, but did not adopt, an amendment to have the Government Accountability Office study the ticket market.

The ticket market has changed a lot in recent years, and more tickets are being sold in secondary markets online. Ticket sellers are experimenting with nontransferable tickets.

We need to better understand this market if we are going to adequately protect consumers. The BOTS Act will do some good to prevent tickets from being scooped up right away for resale.

I see this legislation as a first step, and I hope my colleagues across the aisle would agree. It is not the only improvement that we need to make to help ticket buyers.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the author of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to support the Better On-line Ticket Sales Act, H.R. 5104, or as you have heard it called today, the BOTS Act. It is bipartisan legislation. Mr. TONKO of New York has done a tremendous job working on this with me. Together, we have worked with the Senators to make certain that we have legislation that can be signed into law that will address a problem that so many of our constituents face. Now, we know it is not going to be something that does everything everyone would want, but we do know this is the first step in working with the FTC making certain that we address these bots.

The problem is this: we have some individuals or groups that deploy hacking software—it is called bots. Short for robots, of course—that launch thousands of simultaneous requests for tickets on a ticket site.

Now, I am certain many of us have tried to buy a ticket as soon as they go on sale, just as Ms. SCHAKOWSKY was talking about the performance of Hamilton. We see this a lot with concerts that are coming into Nashville. You go on. You log on. You want to buy that ticket for that sporting event or for that concert, and the bots overwhelm the site and cherry-pick the very best tickets. Then what do you find? You don't have the ability to purchase a ticket.

This has become so frustrating to consumers because they do plan to go on and they do plan to buy that ticket. The site just slows to a crawl, and then when they get through, the tickets are sold out.

This is something that has been very frustrating not only to consumers, but to artists, to entertainers, to fans of live entertainment, and to sports teams.

The artists and the teams often price tickets well below the highest possible price they might be able to get from the fans for any particular event. They do this as a way to invest in that long-term relationship with their fans.

The BOTS Act would make it an unfair and deceptive practice under the FTC Act to use a bot to violate both the terms and conditions of the ticketing site. Also, it creates a mechanism where the State Attorneys General can bring a cause of action against the botsters.

The BOTS Act will stop people from gaming the ticketing system, and it will increase access to events for fans of live entertainment.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5104, the Better On-line Ticket Sales Act, on which I joined in introducing with my colleague and friend from Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN.

This bill would target the unfair practice of using software bots by scalpers to automate the process of purchasing event tickets from online vendor platforms.

As we saw at our legislative hearing on the matter in the Energy and Commerce Committee, the current lack of any Federal statute to deter the practice of using bots has turned the ticket industry in the United States into a rigged system.

For instance on December 8, 2014, a single broker used a bot to purchase over 1,000 tickets for a U2 concert at Madison Square Garden within the first minute of sale. By the end of that day, the same broker and one other had amassed more than 15,000 tickets to U2 shows across North America.

According to an exhaustive investigation by New York State Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, tickets purchased in this manner are then resold on secondary markets at an average of 49 percent above face value, though there are plenty of examples where the markup was more than 1,000 percent.

The people in the capital region of New York and across the rest of our great country worked far too hard to save money enough to see a performance or a game. They should not be shut out from buying tickets online at a reasonable price because a computer program beats them to the punch.

By following the example set by States like New York where unlawful ticket brokers have had to pay stiff penalties for their given actions, we can start to reel in these unfair practices and make sure that Americans have the access to events that they truly deserve.

The BOTS Act expands upon the work of these States by prohibiting the intentional use or the sale of bots software and by barring any tickets acquired in this manner from entry into an event.

This legislation would also establish civil penalties for this behavior on a national level, instructing the FTC or the Attorney General of a State to bring civil action against any persons found in violation.

There is clearly a great deal more that can be done to protect consumers and bring more transparency to the ticket market, but I do believe the BOTS Act represents an excellent step in the right direction for bringing accountability and trust to this industry.

I thank my colleague, Mrs. BLACKBURN, for her hard work on this measure. We have enjoyed working together to come together with this bill, and look forward to continued progress.

I encourage my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, as I said earlier, the BOTS Act is a positive step to improve the ticket market. Today we will advance this bill on a bipartisan basis, which is always good; but I certainly do hope we can work together on further changes to increase transparency and fairness for ticket buyers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I urge our colleagues to support this important legislation. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for bringing it forward. I thank the members of the subcommittee for helping us get it to the floor, and I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5104, the Better On-line Ticket Sales Act, and to discuss what it means for consumers.

Congresswoman BLACKBURN introduced this legislation to combat an issue that many of us are probably very familiar with if you attend entertainment events. Too often, consumers are left in the dust as outside groups take advantage of the system and buy up tickets in large blocks. This results in fans not having access to those events or having to pay more to purchase tickets from a third party vendor. This harms the industry and fans looking to enjoy it on their free time.

Under this bill, software that enables this circumvention of those checks would be prohibited from being sold and tickets purchased in this manner would also be prohibited from being sold. The FTC would enforce these new requirements and people who were affected by these profiteering ventures would be able to bring a civil suit. For too long, these organization and individuals have sidestepped the system with the fan being the one that is most impacted.

Congresswoman BLACKBURN's legislation would overhaul this broken system and punish those who are unwilling to play by the rules. I applaud her work on this issue and the work of the Energy and Commerce Committee to rein in these actions and urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of seven bipartisan bills originating out

of four of our subcommittees that are direct evidence of a very busy and productive session in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This package includes several measures that protect consumers and set Congress' sights forward to fostering next-generation technological development.

We will consider a measure introduced by Full Committee Vice Chairman BLACKBURN, to enhance penalties for the use of automated ticket scalping software. For too long, consumers have been gouged, as scalpers have used software to buy large numbers of event tickets—oftentimes preventing consumers from purchasing them at face value and then charging a 1,000 percent markup to resell those same tickets. This thoughtful legislation, the BOTS Act, is a targeted measure to prevent this practice and to ensure that consumers have fair access to tickets at reasonable prices.

We will also consider a measure authored by Mr. LANCE, along with Mr. KENNEDY, to ensure that online consumer reviews are no longer subject to gag orders—a practice ultimately affecting consumers as it hinders transparency and accountability in product reviews. Our legislation, the Consumer Review Fairness Act, does what it says and will help put a stop to this bad practice.

We will also consider a resolution that makes some important findings with respect to the Internet of Things. Back home in Michigan, folks are turning to smart devices to improve their access to health care, education, transportation, and other services that simplify their lives. This resolution sets forth Congress' unified belief that innovation in this space must be allowed to flourish and that the government must also take advantage of technology.

Similarly, we are putting forward a resolution authored by committee members Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CÁRDENAS that encourages a unified strategy around advanced financial technologies. The FinTech industry has changed how consumers engage in commerce and control their financial information as it lowers cost and increases financial access worldwide. This chamber's support for consumer empowerment through innovation is solidified with this resolution.

On the Health front, today we are also considering Mr. GUTHRIE's Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act. H.R. 921 would ensure that team doctors, trainers, and other licensed health care professionals are covered by their malpractice insurance when providing care to their athletes outside of their primary state.

We will also vote on Mr. KINZINGER's H.R. 1301, which originated out of the Communications and Technology subcommittee, and will ensure amateur radio operators are not prohibited from pursuing their passion simply because they live in a deed-restricted community. Amateur radio plays an important role in emergency response, often able to establish communication in disaster areas when traditional communications networks fail. I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense bill.

Last, but certainly not least, we will consider a measure from Rep. BOB LATTA to help provide certainty for innovators and entrepreneurs who are seeking to develop and license the next generation of nuclear technologies. These technologies may provide breakthroughs in safety and efficiency over the technology in use today. We should ensure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has

the expertise and resources to review and license the latest in advanced reactor technologies and this bill would do just that.

Individually, each of these bills are important but taken together they are evidence of the fine, bipartisan lawmaking that has come to define this committee, and further evidence of our ongoing bipartisan record of success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5104, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSUMER REVIEW FAIRNESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to prohibit the use of certain clauses in form contracts that restrict the ability of a consumer to communicate regarding the goods or services offered in interstate commerce that were the subject of the contract, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Consumer Review Fairness Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. CONSUMER REVIEW PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) COVERED COMMUNICATION.—The term "covered communication" means a written, oral, or pictorial review, performance assessment of, or other similar analysis of, including by electronic means, the goods, services, or conduct of a person by an individual who is party to a form contract with respect to which such person is also a party.

(3) FORM CONTRACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "form contract" means a contract with standardized terms—

(i) used by a person in the course of selling or leasing the person's goods or services; and

(ii) imposed on an individual without a meaningful opportunity for such individual to negotiate the standardized terms.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term "form contract" does not include an employer-employee or independent contractor contract.

(4) PICTORIAL.—The term "pictorial" includes pictures, photographs, video, illustrations, and symbols.

(b) INVALIDITY OF CONTRACTS THAT IMPEDE CONSUMER REVIEWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), a provision of a form contract is void from the inception of such contract if such provision—

(A) prohibits or restricts the ability of an individual who is a party to the form contract to engage in a covered communication;

(B) imposes a penalty or fee against an individual who is a party to the form contract for engaging in a covered communication; or

(C) transfers or requires an individual who is a party to the form contract to transfer to any

person any intellectual property rights in review or feedback content, with the exception of a non-exclusive license to use the content, that the individual may have in any otherwise lawfully covered communication about such person or the goods or services provided by such person.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to affect—

(A) any duty of confidentiality imposed by law (including agency guidance);

(B) any civil cause of action for defamation, libel, or slander, or any similar cause of action;

(C) any party's right to remove or refuse to display publicly on an Internet website or webpage owned, operated, or otherwise controlled by such party any content of a covered communication that—

(i) contains the personal information or likeness of another person, or is libelous, harassing, abusive, obscene, vulgar, sexually explicit, or is inappropriate with respect to race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, or other intrinsic characteristic;

(ii) is unrelated to the goods or services offered by or available at such party's Internet website or webpage; or

(iii) is clearly false or misleading; or

(D) a party's right to establish terms and conditions with respect to the creation of photographs or video of such party's property when those photographs or video are created by an employee or independent contractor of a commercial entity and solely intended for commercial purposes by that entity.

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the extent that a provision of a form contract prohibits disclosure or submission of, or reserves the right of a person or business that hosts online consumer reviews or comments to remove—

(A) trade secrets or commercial or financial information obtained from a person and considered privileged or confidential;

(B) personnel and medical files and similar information the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(C) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(D) content that is unlawful or otherwise meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(C); or

(E) content that contains any computer viruses, worms, or other potentially damaging computer code, processes, programs, applications, or files.

(c) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a person to offer a form contract containing a provision described as void in subsection (b).

(d) ENFORCEMENT BY COMMISSION.—

(1) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of subsection (c) by a person with respect to which the Commission is empowered under section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)) shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person who violates this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(e) ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Subject to paragraph (2), in any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of

any person subject to subsection (c) in a practice that violates such subsection, the attorney general of the State may, as *parens patriae*, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(A) NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under paragraph (1) before initiating the civil action against a person described in subsection (d)(1).

(ii) CONTENTS.—The notification required by clause (i) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by clause (i) before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(B) INTERVENTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The Commission may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1) against a person described in subsection (d)(1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(I) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(II) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(3) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State to conduct investigations, to administer oaths or affirmations, or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(4) PREEMPTIVE ACTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—If the Federal Trade Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of subsection (c), the attorney general of a State may not, during the pendency of such action, bring a civil action under paragraph (1) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for the violation with respect to which the Commission instituted such action.

(5) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(A) VENUE.—Any action brought under paragraph (1) may be brought in—

(i) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(ii) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(i) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(6) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under paragraph (1), any other consumer protection officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

(f) EDUCATION AND OUTREACH FOR BUSINESSES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence conducting education and outreach that provides businesses with non-binding best practices for compliance with this Act.

(g) RELATION TO STATE CAUSES OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to af-

fect any cause of action brought by a person that exists or may exist under State law.

(h) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit, impair, or supersede the operation of the Federal Trade Commission Act or any other provision of Federal law.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATES.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that—

(1) subsections (b) and (c) shall apply with respect to contracts in effect on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) subsections (d) and (e) shall apply with respect to contracts in effect on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of an efficient market is the free flow of information to consumers. The Internet has added hundreds of billions of dollars to the economy, and much of this is due to the ready access that it affords consumers and businesses access to information.

Government officials spend a lot of time worrying about how to ensure that the independent information sources about product and service qualities are available. So the truly great thing about consumer reviews is that, as long as they are reliable sources of information, they are made available at no cost to the consumer or to the taxpayer.

□ 1715

But this benefit is in trouble if we allow businesses to prevent information from ever becoming public. Many of us might hesitate before we give that negative review. Others might be eager to let everyone know just how bad their brunch was, but it probably never crosses anyone's mind that they could be fined if they tell the truth. After all, Americans are used to our freedom of speech.

In one extreme example brought to us by TripAdvisor, travelers were subjected to a \$5 million fine if any "actual opinions and/or publications are created which, at the sole opinion of the businessowner tends directly to injure him in respect to his trade or business . . ."

Now, this is clearly designed to frighten those who read it and frighten them into silence, and those who don't see it might be surprised to hear from

a collection agency asking for \$5 million after posting a negative review.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act outlaws these gag orders. The prohibition is narrowly tailored to only those contracts where there is no opportunity for meaningful negotiations between the consumer and the business. In other words, it only applies to true form contracts. And the bill doesn't interfere with Web site operators' ability to manage the contacts and reviews on their own Web sites. Reasonable management of online reviews is necessary to ensure that they convey useful information as opposed to irrelevant or offensive content.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support free speech and support the passage of H.R. 5111.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. LANCE and Mr. KENNEDY for cosponsoring this bill, and I am pleased to join my colleague in support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act. This bill protects consumers' ability to provide honest reviews of products and services.

Chairman BURGESS is right in saying that if you get a notice that you now owe \$5 million probably just about for anything, you would be surprised; but if it was because you said something truthful based on your experience about a business, that would be particularly egregious.

Lots of mothers have told their children, "If you don't have something nice to say, say nothing at all," but the current practice now takes that way too far.

Businesses have snuck so-called non-disparagement clauses in terms of service agreements, and consumers don't really have a choice when it comes to those form contracts. In fact, they often don't realize they have just given up their right to speak openly about a bad experience. Imagine hiding language in form contracts to stop a bad Yelp review, for example.

For instance, a hotel in New York included a line in its guest policy that customers could be fined \$500 for leaving a bad review online. It seems ridiculous to me that a company would punish a consumer who wants to air complaints, particularly since hotel prices in New York are high enough already, and now you could be slapped with a fine for saying the service wasn't up to par.

This bill would put a stop to that anticonsumer practice. It would stop nondisparagement clauses from being placed in form contracts. Consumers should be able to voice their criticisms, and allowing reviews can help other consumers make informed choices. I look at those. The Consumer Review Fairness Act protects consumer speech, and I look forward to passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), the author of the bill and vice chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer this consumer protection measure along with my cosponsor, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The Consumer Review Fairness Act allows Americans to exercise their First Amendment rights regarding consumer experiences without fear of retribution. This issue comes right from the heart of the 21st century economy. It is easier than ever for consumers to make informed choices on which business or service to use by consulting Web sites and apps that publish crowdsourced reviews of local businesses and restaurants.

Consumer reviews are a powerful informational tool because consumers place a high value on the truthful reviews of other consumers. The trouble is that a number of businesses have become frustrated by online criticism and some have employed the questionable legal remedy known as nondisparagement clauses to retaliate against consumers. These are often buried in fine print, fine print that even these glasses couldn't discern.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act would void any nondisparagement clause in consumer contracts if that clause restricts consumers from publicly reviewing products or businesses accurately and would give the Federal Trade Commission the tools it needs to take action against businesses that insert these provisions into their contracts. It also would ensure companies are still able to remove false and defamatory reviews. And so it is narrowly tailored, but it is fairly tailored.

A few months ago I visited Bovella's Pastry Shoppe in Westfield, New Jersey, in the district I serve here. Bovella's has the highest Yelp review of any bakery in that part of New Jersey. The good people at that bakery have earned reviews from their hard work and excellent consumer service. They get a lot of business from people who turn to Yelp for insight on the best bakery in town. This crowdsourcing system thrives because of its integrity. People trust it. Bad actors who bully consumers are ruining the system that helps small businesses across this country.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE and Dr. BURGESS and Ranking Member SCHAKOWSKY for their leadership in moving this forward. I certainly thank my cosponsor, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). I thank the entire Committee on Energy and Commerce staff and the subcommittee staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this legislation.

This will protect the consuming public in a way that is really what we are trying to do in the 21st century because so much of what we do is based

upon the Internet, based upon apps, and it is important that this Congress make sure that we are up to date in this regard. Please, let's pass this bill to the benefit of online consumers.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the cosponsor of this consumer-friendly legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), my colleague, for yielding and for her leadership on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade. Her efforts in fighting for consumer protection rights and privacy, including her support for this bill, are tireless.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act of 2016. The Consumer Review Fairness Act is a solution to a problem consumers across America are facing. In an unjust effort to stop consumers from posting honest reviews online, some businesses have resorted to hidden contract clauses prohibiting any negative feedback for a product, service, or experience. These so-called nondisparagement clauses allow companies to sue reviewers simply for posting their candid opinions online. This is a problem I have heard about firsthand from a major company in my district, Mr. Speaker, TripAdvisor, whose members depend on an open, honest, and fair online forum.

Like every American, those members have an undeniable right to voice their concerns when an experience or product fails to meet their expectations. Secret nondisparagement clauses limit our free speech and subject unsuspecting individuals to crippling lawsuits from businesses desperately trying to preserve their own reputation.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act makes these clauses illegal and voids any contract that contains a nondisparagement clause. It would allow the Federal Trade Commission to enforce the law and take action against any business that inserts these provisions into their contracts.

Importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill preserves the rights of businessowners to take action against untruthful or dishonest reviews. Businesses still have a right to ensure that no confidential information is unfairly posted and may seek recourse in cases of defamation, libel, or slander.

I think it is fair to say that most of us in this Chamber today have looked at a consumer review prior to purchasing a product or service. In some way or another, we have relied at least some or in part on those reviews, both good and bad. If consumers want to post a truthful review online, they should not fear retribution just because their review is negative.

Mr. Speaker, there are several more people I would like to thank, including, of course, the gentleman from New Jer-

sey (Mr. LANCE) for his leadership and partnership in this effort; the subcommittee chair, Mr. BURGESS, and his staff; Chairman UPTON; Ranking Member PALLONE; and, as I said, the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I would like to thank also my good friend, ERIC SWALWELL, who has led legislative efforts on this issue for years. Lastly, and certainly not least, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my gratitude to the majority and minority staff of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for their hard work and engaging in good faith discussion to help get this bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5111.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I advise the minority that we have no additional speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act is a step forward not only for protecting consumers' speech, but for, really, the millions of consumers who rely on the reviews, the opinions of others, and believe that you get a fair mix of reviews, good and bad, that will enable you to make better purchasing decisions.

This bill passed on a bipartisan basis through both the subcommittee and full committee, and I look forward to passing it today. I want to thank all those who were involved in making this happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support free speech and support the passage of H.R. 5111.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act of 2016.

One of the most amazing aspects of the Internet is its ability to allow for the sharing of information, and consumers often rely on the reviews of others to make purchasing decisions. This system only works if consumers have access to all information available from across the nation, including both positive and negative reviews. We simply cannot allow companies to bully or attempt to silence customers who want to offer negative but honest assessments of products or services.

I was outraged when I first heard last Congress that companies were doing exactly that, using buried contractual terms, known as nondisparagement clauses, to try to block or punish customers for writing negative reviews online. To end this practice I introduced H.R. 5499, the Consumer Review Freedom Act of 2014, a narrow bill designed to outlaw nondisparagement clauses and empower the government to stop companies from using them while maintaining the ability of businesses to sue for traditional defamation. This Congress, Representative Darrell Issa and I introduced a bipartisan version of this legislation.

Today the House is considering H.R. 5111, very similar to our Consumer Review Freedom

Act but with some improvements. I want to thank Representatives Leonard Lance and Joe Kennedy for introducing this legislation and working diligently to move it forward. The Senate has already passed essentially the same bill, and so I hope once the House acts today the Senate can quickly pass H.R. 5111 and send it to the President's desk for his signature. This will be an important step in protecting a vital source of information for consumers across the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5111.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5111, the Consumer Review Fairness Act, which would protect consumers' First Amendment right to share their experiences with a product or service online. Millions of Americans go online every day to read candid experiences from like-minded consumers, and many also share their reviews on everything from restaurants to clothing to hotels and services.

American consumers should feel confident in providing honest reviews, as the First Amendment protects their right to express their opinions. As a former small business owner, I know that listening to customer feedback is crucial for success, and that constructive criticism is sometimes more helpful than praise. Unfortunately, some businesses have found ways to bully consumers with costly penalties and lawsuits in an effort to hide negative reviews. Instead of trying to improve their own practices, these bad actors are taking their mistakes out on their own customers.

The Consumer Review Fairness Act would stop this unethical practice by prohibiting businesses from penalizing consumers for sharing a review they don't agree with. Our modern day economy is dependent on the free flow of information, and this bill will ensure consumers' rights to openly review products and services are not infringed upon.

I would like to thank my colleagues for introducing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5111, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE ABOUT A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives about a national strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 847

Whereas the Internet of Things currently connects tens of billions of devices world-

wide and has the potential to generate trillions of dollars in economic opportunity;

Whereas increased connectivity can empower consumers in nearly every aspect of their daily lives, including in the fields of agriculture, education, energy, healthcare, public safety, security, and transportation, to name just a few;

Whereas businesses across the economy can simplify logistics, cut costs in supply chains, and pass savings on to consumers because of the Internet of Things and innovations derived from it;

Whereas the Internet of Things, through augmented data collection and process analyses, optimizes energy consumption by increasing energy efficiency and reducing usage and demand;

Whereas the United States should strive to be a world leader in smart cities and smart infrastructure to ensure its citizens and businesses, in both rural and urban parts of the country, have access to the safest and most resilient communities in the world;

Whereas the United States is the world leader in developing the Internet of Things technology, and with a national strategy guiding both public and private entities, the United States will continue to produce breakthrough technologies and lead the world in innovation;

Whereas the evolution of the Internet of Things is a nascent market, the future direction of which holds much promise;

Whereas businesses should implement reasonable privacy and cybersecurity practices and protect consumers' personal information to increase confidence, trust, and acceptance of this emerging market;

Whereas the Internet of Things represents a wide range of technologies, in numerous industry sectors and overseen by various governmental entities; and

Whereas coordination between all stakeholders of the Internet of Things on relevant developments, impediments, and achievements is a vital ingredient to the continued advancement of pioneering technology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States should develop a national strategy to encourage the development of the Internet of Things in a way that maximizes the promise connected technologies hold to empower consumers, foster future economic growth, and improve the Nation's collective social well-being;

(2) the United States should prioritize accelerating the development and deployment of the Internet of Things in a way that recognizes its benefits, allows for future innovation, and responsibly protects against misuse;

(3) the United States should recognize the important role that businesses play in the future development of the Internet of Things and engage in inclusive dialogue with industry and work cooperatively wherever possible;

(4) the United States Government should determine if using the Internet of Things can improve Government efficiency and effectiveness and cut waste, fraud, and abuse; and

(5) using the Internet of Things, innovators in the United States should commit to improving the quality of life for future generations by developing safe, new technologies aimed at tackling the most challenging societal issues facing the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 847, the Internet of things, kind of a novel concept. The Internet of things represents a significant opportunity for economic growth and for innovation. It represents an opportunity for job creation across virtually every industry and every sector in the United States. The integration of the Internet and networked sensors into physical objects and things creates opportunities for new conveniences, creates opportunities for increased productivity, and substantial efficiency gains throughout our economy. According to McKinsey & Company, the Internet of things has a potential economic impact of \$4 trillion to \$11 trillion by the year 2025.

□ 1730

As the technology develops and matures, Internet connectivity is capturing more than just objects and traditional household items such as refrigerators, thermostats, and televisions. Today, Internet connectivity is being integrated into industrial processes, transportation routes, workforce practices, supply chain logistics, city operations, and much more. These advancements have been particularly beneficial to the manufacturing sector, where they are enabling greater workplace productivity, factory floor efficiency, and enhanced employee safety.

As a physician who has served people in north Texas for over 25 years before I came to Congress, I see great potential for the Internet of things, particularly in the healthcare space. Internet-connected devices, machines, and applications are creating opportunities for better quality and more efficient care. In addition to providing these benefits, connected healthcare devices help reduce healthcare costs and other health-related expenses that have long been a drag on our economy and on consumers' wallets.

In recognizing the potential for the Internet of things, H. Res. 847 establishes our commitment to realizing that potential through strategic investments that ensure that the Internet of things becomes the engine for job creation, innovation, and economic growth that it promises to be.

Through a national strategy, stakeholders can engage in a more collaborative discussion and resources can be used more effectively, more efficiently to foster the future development of the Internet of things market.

Importantly, a national strategy will foster more consumer confidence, more

consumer trust, and more consumer acceptance in the Internet of things. This, in turn, will drive greater adoption, additional growth opportunities, and societal benefits.

I thank Vice Chairman LANCE for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me congratulate Mr. LANCE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LATTA, and Congresswoman CLARKE for their work on this important legislation.

The Internet of things is an area of great innovation that deserves attention from Congress. And fortunately, in our subcommittee, we have done just that.

Today, people track their physical activity with wearable devices. We have thermostats in our home that you can control from your phone from anywhere in the world. And that is, of course, only scratching the surface of consumer products that are right now available.

We have been examining some of the issues related to the Internet of things in the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee. One thing is clear to me: technology is moving at a rapid pace, and our laws need to keep pace. I support developing a Federal strategy for how we approach this exciting area of technology.

I would like to underscore a few key principles that must be a part of this approach: one, data security must be protected; two, Americans should understand and consent to the information that consumer devices are collecting; three, these products should be developed with safety in mind.

Agencies like the Federal Trade Commission and Consumer Product Safety Commission already work to promote data security, consumer privacy, and safety. But Congress needs to make sure we provide these agencies the resources and authorities necessary to address today's issues.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to promote innovation in this space and to ensure that the Internet of things further develops in a manner that works for business as well as consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), the author of this legislation, vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I have never been prouder of the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee than I am on this issue. I congratulate Chairman BURGESS and Ranking Member SCHAKOWSKY for their leadership on this issue, and certainly Mr. WELCH for his leadership as well.

I offer this resolution to highlight the importance of the Internet of

things, also known as the Internet of everything. The Internet of things is the network of sensors and electronics in physical objects, ranging from household appliances, such as thermostats to manufacturing equipment.

The Internet of things currently connects tens of billions of devices worldwide and assists consumers in nearly every aspect of their daily lives, including in the field of agriculture, education, energy, health care, public safety, security, and transportation, among many others. The lives of nearly every American are run more efficiently thanks to the Internet of things and the great advances in innovation here in the 21st century.

Our role in Congress should be to help make the Internet of things thrive, to facilitate a Federal support system that empowers exciting new ideas. Ideas such as the 5G radio by Nokia Bell Labs in Murray Hill—Nokia has taken over Bell Labs, but, of course, Bell Labs is fabled in the history of this country and had been so for many, many years—the Smart Cities initiative by Qualcomm in Bridgewater—also in the district I represent—and Verizon in Basking Ridge are helping towns and cities maintain high standards of livability, resiliency, and sustainability by using IOT technology to help city planners create better qualities of life.

Of course, as Chairman BURGESS has indicated, healthcare applications in this area are very promising. They are patient centered and they are economically beneficial. This will be beneficial not only to patients but, of course, to the Medicare and Medicaid programs as well.

According to the management consulting firm McKinsey & Company, the Internet of things has the potential to contribute anywhere from \$4 trillion to \$11 trillion to the economy over the course of the next several decades—this is an enormous increase—based upon innovation here in the 21st century.

The resolution expresses the current and potential future benefits of the Internet of things. I hope that it will put Congress on record in working for its growth and success.

This is really at the heart of what we should be doing in Congress in a bipartisan capacity: getting ahead of the curve on the future of technology in the United States, as the United States, we all hope, will continue to be the leader worldwide in this and other matters. That is why the Internet of things is so important. That is why I am so pleased to be involved with others in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this, of course, will pass unanimously, and I hope that it will be a harbinger for what we should doing in Congress in so many other areas as well.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a cosponsor and coauthor of this legislation, as well as my good friend.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate the gentlewoman's leadership and, by the way, for her fierce leadership on consumer rights for the bill that just passed. I thank my colleagues, Mr. BURGESS and Mr. LANCE, whom I really appreciate, and, of course, the committee chair, FRED UPTON, and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE.

Mr. Speaker, you would be glad to know that we work pretty hard to be bipartisan and productive in the Energy and Commerce Committee. It takes a good deal of effort on both sides.

This legislation is really an acknowledgement about this new technology—the application of the Internet to activities that are cutting across the entire economy, everything from agriculture to medicine—and it is an acknowledgment by Congress that this is a private sector-led, entrepreneurial-led range of opportunities that has the potential to increase efficiency and productivity.

For instance, on farms you have GPS planting done by GPS-guided tractors. It results in much better planting with fewer seeds. It saves money and increases crop yields.

In medicine, as you know, telemedicine is being tremendously helpful to folks, like in Vermont, where we are a very rural State and it is tough for folks to make a 60-, 70-mile journey to the VA. With telemedicine, we are able to have the doctor in that person's local office. So it is a tremendous benefit to consumers there as well.

The other thing that is really important is that, for this to be deployed, it is not a matter of us trying to come up with a regulation. The innovations that are occurring are so rapid that it really would be impossible for anybody to write a regulation that would be anything but obstructive.

On the other hand, with Congress getting involved, there are going to be, as we go along, some issues of privacy and some issues of cybersecurity. When it comes to health records, all of us are going to be certain that those records are safe and private. When it comes to other things, like if somebody hacks into your Fitbit and finds out how many steps you took in a day, it is not such a big deal.

But this is where Congress is going to have to play a role, because industry is going to want to be certain that the rights of their consumers and the users of their products are being protected and their information is private and safe.

So we are acknowledging, as a Congress, Republicans and Democrats, that there is this new frontier with use of the Internet where entrepreneurs in the private sector are coming up with applications that can improve efficiency and productivity in almost every walk of life.

One of the ongoing challenges in our committee will be to make certain that the broadband infrastructure that

is required in order to make this benefit available to folks in rural America is built out properly.

I have been working very closely with BOB LATTA of Ohio, who has a big rural district, to try to make certain that we have a commitment in the technology space for broadband deployment all across America. It makes a huge difference in rural communities in our State of Vermont and BOB LATTA's district in Ohio, where, if you have somebody who has got a good idea in a business, if they are in a small town with a population of a couple hundred people, as long as they have high-speed Internet, they are going to be able to take advantage of this.

So it is a pleasure, I think, for all of us to find something that we agree on that is substantive and is important. I thank all the folks who have had a hand in bringing us here to this moment where we are going to have an opportunity to vote on this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this. The language of this resolution is very clear. It is the sense of the House of Representatives: "the United States should develop a national strategy to encourage the development of the Internet of things in a way that maximizes the promise connected technologies hold to empower consumers, foster future economic growth, and improve the Nation's collective social well-being."

So, with passing this resolution, we are setting the table for future work to make sure that we encourage these developments.

I want to thank so much all the sponsors and our chairmen of the subcommittee and full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank Vice Chairman LANCE for his leadership on this important issue, and I urge an "aye" vote on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 847, which would express the sense of the House of Representatives about a national strategy for the Internet of Things.

We are truly living in the internet age, and new technologies are developing each day. High performing mobile devices and cloud technologies that seemed so new are already commonplace in the business world and at home.

Broadband internet access is expanding into communities across the nation, and it is more affordable than ever. As innovators add internet connectivity to an increasing number of ordinary objects, we need to be thinking ahead to the next big thing.

H. Res. 847 expresses the sense that we need to encourage innovation and development of these technologies through cooperation with industry and consumers. It is also important to look ahead to how the Internet of Things can be used to improve the efficiency

of our government and reduce waste and abuse.

By preparing for these technologies now, our nation will enjoy greater benefits in the future. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 847.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1745

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING A NATIONAL POLICY FOR TECHNOLOGY TO PROMOTE CONSUMERS' ACCESS TO FINANCIAL TOOLS AND ONLINE COMMERCE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 835) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt a national policy for technology to promote consumers' access to financial tools and online commerce to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 835

Whereas technology solutions have the potential to improve consumers' ability to control their economic well-being, to encourage their financial literacy, and improve their knowledge base and increase their options to manage their finances and engage in commerce;

Whereas new payment methods and new payment strategies reflect new commercial opportunities;

Whereas the United States is the world leader in software development and technology creation;

Whereas financial technology is creating new opportunities for the 24,800,000 underbanked households in the United States;

Whereas the growth of consumers' use of mobile devices and the deployment of broadband access has supported the growth of financial technology products and services outside of traditional products and services offered by banks and other financial institutions in the United States increasing commerce and job growth;

Whereas identity theft is a rising concern for people in the United States as their personal information is targeted by criminal enterprises for monetization on the black market;

Whereas cyberattacks against domestic and international financial institutions and cooperatives continue;

Whereas emerging payment options, including alternative non-fiat currencies, are leveraging technology to improve security

through increased transparency and verifiable trust mechanisms to supplant decades old payment technology deployed by traditional financial institutions; and

Whereas blockchain technology with the appropriate protections has the potential to fundamentally change the manner in which trust and security are established in online transactions through various potential applications in sectors including financial services, payments, health care, energy, property management, and intellectual property management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States should develop a national policy to encourage the development of tools for consumers to learn and protect their assets in a way that maximizes the promise customized, connected devices hold to empower consumers, foster future economic growth, create new commerce and new markets;

(2) the United States should prioritize accelerating the development of alternative technologies that support transparency, security, and authentication in a way that recognizes their benefits, allows for future innovation, and responsibly protects consumers' personal information;

(3) the United States should recognize that technology experts can play an important role in the future development of consumer-facing technology applications for manufacturing, automobiles, telecommunications, tourism, health care, energy, and general commerce;

(4) the United States should support further innovation, and economic growth, and ensure cybersecurity, and the protection of consumer privacy; and

(5) innovators in technology, manufacturing, automobiles, telecommunications, tourism, health care, and energy industries should commit to improving the quality of life for future generations by developing safe and consumer protective, new technology aimed at improving consumers' access to commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 835.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, I have chaired two hearings in our Disrupter Series exploring fintech. Over the last year, the subcommittee has examined mobile payments, digital currencies, and blockchain technology. There is no question that this new technology is changing the face of global payments and commerce.

The rise of the smartphone has drastically changed consumer behavior

when it comes to mobile payments. Checking an online account and transferring money is as easy as checking email on your smartphone.

In 2014, 22 percent of mobile phone users reported making a purchase on their phone. Thirty-nine percent used their phones to make a purchase in a store.

Global investment in financial technology ventures tripled in 2014 to \$12 billion, and increased 67 percent in the first quarter of 2016. Payment companies and marketplace lenders account for about two-thirds of these highly valued startups.

One of the cutting-edge areas of this innovation is around blockchain, a ledger-based technology fundamentally based on transparency. Blockchain technology holds the potential to disrupt healthcare records management, manufacturing supply chain management, real estate recordkeeping, international clearing and settlement functions, and even regulatory oversight by government agencies.

Peer-to-peer asset transfer online has been a challenge for a number of industries since the rise of the Internet. Blockchain technology has offered one potential solution that many industries could leverage in the future to protect their intellectual property.

There is no doubt that blockchain innovations are on the cutting edge today. For every story about the amazing potential applications, there is another story outlining a doomsday scenario. While innovation can be frightening, discovery should be encouraged because the public will never see the benefits without assuming some measured risk.

This resolution reaffirms Congress' commitment to innovation. I support H. Res. 835, and I would like to thank Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CÁRDENAS for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to acknowledge the work of Congressman KINZINGER and Congressman CÁRDENAS in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

In the last year or so, fintech, financial technology, has become the new buzzword on Capitol Hill.

Finance and technology have long had a close relationship. For decades, banks have been able to send money between themselves nearly instantaneously. Consumers have easy access to online and mobile banking services.

Now, more technology is coming into consumers' hands. Person-to-person payment apps have made check-splitting at restaurants much less of an ordeal. Blockchain is being used to send remittances around the world.

The challenge for Federal regulators is to understand and adapt to this new technology. Fintech does not always involve traditional financial institutions. It has increased the amount of

potentially sensitive consumer information being stored and transmitted. If we want innovation to continue and for consumers to trust this technology, we must ensure that data security is baked in.

We also need to consider how new technology works with existing rules to prevent money laundering and terrorist financing. These are not easy issues, but they are critical to furthering innovation, which I hope will lead to lower costs and better services for consumers.

This resolution recognizes that Congress and Federal agencies need to be working on policies that promote the responsible development of fintech. I look forward to working with my colleagues to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), the author of this legislation, in support of his resolution.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and Ranking Member SCHAKOWSKY for their work on this and their help.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 835. It is a resolution adopting a national policy to promote economic growth and consumer access to financial tools through technology.

I introduced this resolution with the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) earlier this year to highlight the importance of supporting a growing industry at the intersection of consumer finance and technology, otherwise known as fintech. I would like to thank him for joining me to ensure that the United States is competitively positioned to leverage this next wave of technology for the economy and for consumers' benefits.

Fintech is leading the charge in taking payments to the next level in terms of speed, convenience, efficiency, and accessibility, and is fundamentally changing the amount of transparency and control consumers have over their information.

Fintech startups have created a surge in payment innovation, ranging from new mobile payment options to digital currencies outside of traditional government-issued currency. There are over 2,000 fintech startups, and more than a dozen that are currently valued at over \$1 billion.

Mobile payments revenues in 2016 are expected to surpass the \$600 billion mark, and this year, 45 percent of consumers use some form of mobile payments. And with that investment comes new jobs and new opportunities.

Given all of this, there is still a host of questions about these offerings that industry and government at all levels must continue to work through. Questions about security, privacy, and consumer protection are important and will guide how public and private entities continue to review and assess emerging technologies.

However, potential risks and 20th century silos between government

agencies should not hamper innovation in this space.

In an age where mobile devices are ubiquitous, consumers are demanding a higher level of transparency and control over their financial information. Due to the proliferation of mobile devices, we have an opportunity to capitalize on an emerging technology that we cannot afford to miss out on. The only question is who is going to lead the way in this process.

This resolution sends a clear message that it will be the United States, and that Congress supports continued innovation and consumer empowerment.

Again, I want to just say thank you to my friends on both sides of the aisle for bringing this up, what I think is a very good bipartisan resolution and a good first step to doing what we need to do.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), the cosponsor and coauthor of this resolution.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend for yielding the time, and also for her leadership, my colleague, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

And also to my colleague, Congressman KINZINGER, I thank him for introducing this legislation. It is my honor to work with the gentleman, and especially across the aisle on something that we all agree on and realize that this is something that we need to take responsible steps in harnessing here in this country when it comes to the issue at hand.

Today, financial service companies are undergoing another profound era of change. In the United States alone, there are 85 million millennials, a generation considerably more open to non-traditional financial services than past generations. This is almost the same amount of Americans who have little or no relationship with a bank. That means no checking or savings account for those people.

We also know that there are more than 1 billion smartphones worldwide, with more than 200 million in the U.S. alone. People today have 24-hours-a-day mobile access to financial services providers, regardless of how far they are from the nearest bank branch.

The fintech revolution can bridge the gap between those who are banked and those who are not. Anyone with a cell phone should also be able to save, invest, transfer, and improve their financial experience safely.

For example, our society has an unprecedented amount of choices when purchasing or selling products in person and/or online.

Blockchain technology, the system behind bitcoin has the potential to fundamentally disrupt the way we think of not just currency exchanges but also health care, energy, and intellectual property.

Of course, every new system must incorporate safeguards against those who want to take advantage of it. Finding

the balance between the development of new technology and the protection of our personal information is not only necessary but critical. That is why Representative KINZINGER and I introduced H. Res. 835, the bipartisan financial technology resolution.

It is time Congress recognizes and encourages innovation, while setting the tone for security and transparency. This resolution underscores fintech's ability to improve a consumer's experience when it comes to managing their finances online.

It also states that fintech could help increase financial literacy rates across the U.S. by creating new opportunities for the nearly 25 million households in the United States that are still unbanked.

Let it be known: identity theft is a real concern for all Americans at all levels. But the good news is that many within fintech are committed to improving security through increased transparency and verifiable trust mechanisms.

Not only does fintech give small businesses and consumers an alternative way to bank, it also offers the possibility of a safer, more convenient financial experience while creating U.S. jobs.

Seeing as the United States is the world leader in software development and technology, it is in our best interest to develop a national policy. We must drive innovation, boost economic growth, and ensure the protection of every American's personal information.

Fintech not only makes products and services more accessible to the consumer, but it can also make these services more affordable. It is needless to say that fintech has great potential in our future.

We need to do what we have to, as government, to unleash the creativity, convenience, but more importantly, its responsible and safe environment for these technologies, all the while, seeing to it that we stay out of the way of getting in the way of the billions and eventually trillions of dollars that will be manifested through this new industry; and that means, jobs, jobs, jobs right here in America.

If we don't harness this policy, if we don't work with the industries, if we don't do our job as making sure that we set the tone, not only for this country but for the world, we may find ourselves missing out on this tremendous opportunity on behalf of the American public and the American worker.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H. Res. 835, the bipartisan fintech bill.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the passage of H. Res. 835.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution reaffirms Congress' commitment to innovation. I support H. Res. 835. I want to

thank again Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. CÁRDENAS for their leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 835, which encourages the development of new technologies that increase consumers' access to commerce and financial tools. This is an exciting time in American Commerce.

Each day, innovators are connecting consumers, industries, and markets through brand new technologies and connected devices. These new technologies will empower American consumers and our economy like never before. With innovations coming so rapidly, we need to ensure that these new technologies are not at the expense of consumer privacy and cybersecurity.

These resolutions would support American innovation in financial technology, transparency, security, and consumer empowerment while protecting consumers' personal information. By improving consumers' access to commerce through technological means, we can greatly improve the quality of life for future Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution so that our innovators can confidently take on the challenge of developing technology for tomorrow's marketplace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 835.)

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AMATEUR RADIO PARITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1301) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to extend to private land use restrictions its rule relating to reasonable accommodation of amateur service communications, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Amateur Radio Parity Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) More than 730,000 radio amateurs in the United States are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission in the amateur radio services.

(2) Amateur radio, at no cost to taxpayers, provides a fertile ground for technical self-training in modern telecommunications, electronics technology, and emergency communications techniques and protocols.

(3) There is a strong Federal interest in the effective performance of amateur stations established at the residences of licensees. Such stations have been shown to be frequently and increasingly precluded by unreasonable private land use restrictions, including restrictive covenants.

(4) Federal Communications Commission regulations have for three decades prohibited the application to stations in the amateur service of State and local regulations that preclude or fail to reasonably accommodate amateur service communications, or that do not constitute the minimum practicable regulation to accomplish a legitimate State or local purpose. Commission policy has been and is to require States and localities to permit erection of a station antenna structure at heights and dimensions sufficient to accommodate amateur service communications.

(5) The Commission has sought guidance and direction from Congress with respect to the application of the Commission's limited preemption policy regarding amateur service communications to private land use restrictions, including restrictive covenants.

(6) There are aesthetic and common property considerations that are uniquely applicable to private land use regulations and the community associations obligated to enforce covenants, conditions, and restrictions in deed-restricted communities. These considerations are dissimilar to those applicable to State law and local ordinances regulating the same residential amateur radio facilities.

(7) In recognition of these considerations, a separate Federal policy than exists at section 97.15(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, is warranted concerning amateur service communications in deed-restricted communities.

(8) Community associations should fairly administer private land use regulations in the interest of their communities, while nevertheless permitting the installation and maintenance of effective outdoor amateur radio antennas. There exist antenna designs and installations that can be consistent with the aesthetics and physical characteristics of land and structures in community associations while accommodating communications in the amateur radio services.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF PRIVATE LAND USE RESTRICTIONS TO AMATEUR STATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF FCC RULES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall amend section 97.15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, by adding a new paragraph that prohibits the application to amateur stations of any private land use restriction, including a restrictive covenant, that—

(1) on its face or as applied, precludes communications in an amateur radio service;

(2) fails to permit a licensee in an amateur radio service to install and maintain an effective outdoor antenna on property under the exclusive use or control of the licensee; or

(3) does not constitute the minimum practicable restriction on such communications to accomplish the lawful purposes of a community association seeking to enforce such restriction.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In amending its rules as required by subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) require any licensee in an amateur radio service to notify and obtain prior approval from a community association concerning installation of an outdoor antenna;

(2) permit a community association to prohibit installation of any antenna or antenna support structure by a licensee in an amateur radio service on common property not under the exclusive use or control of the licensee; and

(3) subject to the standards specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), permit a community association to establish reasonable written rules concerning height, location, size, and aesthetic impact of, and installation requirements for, outdoor antennas and support structures for the purpose of conducting communications in the amateur radio services.

SEC. 4. AFFIRMATION OF LIMITED PREEMPTION OF STATE AND LOCAL LAND USE REGULATION.

The Federal Communications Commission may not change section 97.15(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, which shall remain applicable to State and local land use regulation of amateur service communications.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION.**—The term “community association” means any non-profit mandatory membership organization composed of owners of real estate described in a declaration of covenants or created pursuant to a covenant or other applicable law with respect to which a person, by virtue of the person’s ownership of or interest in a unit or parcel, is obligated to pay for a share of real estate taxes, insurance premiums, maintenance, improvement, services, or other expenses related to common elements, other units, or any other real estate other than the unit or parcel described in the declaration.

(2) **TERMS DEFINED IN REGULATIONS.**—The terms “amateur radio services”, “amateur service”, and “amateur station” have the meanings given such terms in section 97.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1800

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill H.R. 1301.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding. I also want to thank Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member ESHOO for working with me to get this legislation to a point where all interested parties are able to support its passage today.

Additionally, I would like to thank the representatives from the ARRL and CAI for meeting with our offices time and again to come to an agreement that helps us move forward on this legislation in a bipartisan and very positive manner.

Under current law, there is an outright prohibition on the use of any antennae for amateur radio use in certain areas with no consideration for the emergency ramifications that come as a result. For some, this is merely a nuisance; but for others, those who use their amateur radio license for life-saving emergency communications, a dangerous situation can be created by limiting their ability to establish effective communication for those in need.

During times of emergency service, such as following a hurricane or tor-

nado, amateur radio operators are able to use their skills and equipment to create a network of communications for first responders when other wired or wireless technologies are down—a vital and lifesaving function.

Additionally, there are some hams that take their certifications even further by purchasing expensive equipment and going through extensive training to become part of MARS, the Military Auxiliary Radio System. The purpose of MARS is to help our military patch through their communications to one another domestically and abroad, and I have personally used this system as a pilot in the military.

What is so impressive about this group is what it takes to be part of this system. MARS members must have access to expensive, high-frequency radio equipment; it must file monthly reports; and they participate in a minimum of 12 hours of radio activity each quarter, all on their own dime and all on their own time.

This legislation that is brought before us today would change current regulations hampering the ability of amateur radio operators to effectively communicate in certain areas while respecting and maintaining the rights of local communities in those areas where hams reside.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the willingness of all the interested groups in coming to the table with myself, with Chairman WALDEN, and Ranking Member ESHOO, in order to come to an amicable agreement on how to move this legislation forward. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 1301, the Amateur Radio Parity Act.

Mr. Speaker, I commend both cosponsors here, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut, who have placed common sense into this legislative format that will drive fairness, I believe, into the equation for amateur radio operators.

Operators provide essential services in times of emergencies, and they should not be prohibited from building their facilities. They provide a very useful role in our given neighborhoods and communities. H.R. 1301 will provide for new rules that will help these operators navigate homeowner association restrictions when they are attempting to build their given stations.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, strikes the right balance to ensure that homeowner associations can impose reasonable regulations for amateur radio towers, but it would also make sure that amateur radio enthusiasts can continue to operate.

I do congratulate Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member ESHOO for their work to come up with an agreement that everyone can support based on the efforts of the cosponsors of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), my good friend.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to, again, thank my friend, Mr. TONKO, and salute his great work on the Energy and Commerce Committee, as well as Mr. BURGESS and Mr. KINZINGER. For the last two Congresses we have worked together to get this legislation to the place we are at this evening. Again, it really recognizes the passionate work and highly skilled work that over 700,000 ham radio operators conduct every day in this country.

A couple of years ago in Hartford, Connecticut, they had the Centennial Convention of the American Radio Relay League, which brought together thousands of ham operators from all over the country to share their skills and to look at the latest innovation and technology, which Mr. KINZINGER referred to and, again, talked about the networks that they collaborate on in terms of early weather warnings as well as assisting the American military.

Last Congress, we had 69 bipartisan cosponsors. This year, it grew to 126, and, again, that is because of the external grassroots pressure which these groups brought forward. Again, they have no sort of skin in the game in terms of any personal benefit. As the Congressman from Illinois said, they are all basically volunteers. But I think it is important to realize this is not just a feel-good bill. This is about really strengthening our systems of emergency services and first responders that are out there.

In the State of Connecticut in 2014 we got a pretty good taste of this when Hurricane Sandy hit. It basically struck the power grid down for about 10 days or so. In the wake of that, we saw all the advanced communication that we take for granted—whether it is cable communication or cellular communication—completely sort of fall by the wayside. So the only way that first responders could communicate, the folks who were delivering emergency medical care to the State during that time period was, in fact, going back in time and relying on the ham radio operators to make sure that these groups were in real-time communication.

So what this bill seeks to do is to rebalance what has happened out there in terms of land use restrictions that have inhibited the ability of these really hardworking volunteers—American patriots I would argue—to really perform this critical duty.

The vast majority of homes that have been built since the 1980s in this country have contained some type of deed restrictions that have inhibited that capability. As a result of this legislation, it will sort of rebalance legitimate property rights of private property owners to make sure that non-intrusive antennas and technology will

be able to allow this network to continue to thrive and to do the great work that it does to support local disaster response all across the country.

I had a conversation recently with the chairman of the FCC, Tom Wheeler, who, again, as an organization going back to the 1970s, has recognized the value of amateur radio in terms of bolstering America's communication system providing kind of a redundancy system, a backup system, in case, again, the advanced stuff that we take for granted now is struck down by external events. He strongly supports this legislation.

Again, I want to salute the great bipartisan work that was done on the Energy and Commerce Committee to bring this bill after 3 long years to the floor here, and I strongly urge all the Members to support its passage.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the cosponsors of this legislation have struck a very sound balance between the interests of the homeowner associations and amateur radio operators. It is done in a spirit of bipartisanship. So for those reasons, I strongly suggest we support the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1301, the Amateur Radio Parity Act, and its positive effects on amateur radio operators and our communities.

Amateur radio operators not only participate due to interests in the hobby, but also because they serve an important role in the communications and coordination of communities and emergency services.

Under existing regulations, amateur radio operators can be subjected to regulations that other industries are not subject to, effectively singling them out. This bill doesn't display favoritism, it simply created an equal playing field for an industry that is little known, but contributes immensely to the well-being of our communities.

The Amateur Radio Parity Act would ensure that amateur operators are able to continue their hobby within the confines of the law, including in deed-restricted communities.

Across the United States, there are more than 720,000 amateur radio operators licensed by the FCC whose services to their communities cost nothing to the taxpayers.

They are instrumental in helping to coordinate during natural disasters and have provided services to organizations including the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, FEMA and the Department of Defense.

As the Representative for coastal Georgia, I know all too well the effects of a natural disaster on an area and the benefits to having in place every protection possible to help combat the challenges that arise in those difficult times.

I applaud my good friend Mr. KINZINGER for his work on this issue and the work of the Energy and Commerce Committee to address these reforms and I urge passage of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1301, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to amend its rules so as to prohibit the application to amateur stations of certain private land use restrictions, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPORTS MEDICINE LICENSURE CLARITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 921) to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 921

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PROTECTIONS FOR COVERED SPORTS MEDICINE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In the case of a covered sports medicine professional who has in effect medical professional liability insurance coverage and provides in a secondary State covered medical services that are within the scope of practice of such professional in the primary State to an athlete or an athletic team (or a staff member of such an athlete or athletic team) pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (b)(4) with respect to such athlete or athletic team—

(1) *such medical professional liability insurance coverage shall cover (subject to any related premium adjustments) such professional with respect to such covered medical services provided by the professional in the secondary State to such an individual or team as if such services were provided by such professional in the primary State to such an individual or team; and*

(2) *to the extent such professional is licensed under the requirements of the primary State to provide such services to such an individual or team, the professional shall be treated as satisfying any licensure requirements of the secondary State to provide such services to such an individual or team.*

(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) *ATHLETE.*—The term "athlete" means—

(A) *an individual participating in a sporting event or activity for which the individual may be paid;*

(B) *an individual participating in a sporting event or activity sponsored or sanctioned by a national governing body; or*

(C) *an individual for whom a high school or institution of higher education provides a covered sports medicine professional.*

(2) *ATHLETIC TEAM.*—The term "athletic team" means a sports team—

(A) *composed of individuals who are paid to participate on the team;*

(B) *composed of individuals who are participating in a sporting event or activity sponsored or sanctioned by a national governing body; or*

(C) *for which a high school or an institution of higher education provides a covered sports medicine professional.*

(3) *COVERED MEDICAL SERVICES.*—The term "covered medical services" means general medical care, emergency medical care, athletic training, or physical therapy services. Such term does not include care provided by a covered sports medicine professional—

(A) *at a health care facility; or*

(B) *while a health care provider licensed to practice in the secondary State is transporting the injured individual to a health care facility.*

(4) *COVERED SPORTS MEDICINE PROFESSIONAL.*—The term "covered sports medicine professional" means a physician, athletic trainer, or other health care professional who—

(A) *is licensed to practice in the primary State;*

(B) *provides covered medical services, pursuant to a written agreement with an athlete, an athletic team, a national governing body, a high school, or an institution of higher education; and*

(C) *prior to providing the covered medical services described in subparagraph (B), has disclosed the nature and extent of such services to the entity that provides the professional with liability insurance in the primary State.*

(5) *HEALTH CARE FACILITY.*—The term "health care facility" means a facility in which medical care, diagnosis, or treatment is provided on an inpatient or outpatient basis. Such term does not include facilities at an arena, stadium, or practice facility, or temporary facilities existing for events where athletes or athletic teams may compete.

(6) *INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.*—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(7) *NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY.*—The term "national governing body" has the meaning given such term in section 220501 of title 36, United States Code.

(8) *PRIMARY STATE.*—The term "primary State" means, with respect to a covered sports medicine professional, the State in which—

(A) *the covered sports medicine professional is licensed to practice; and*

(B) *the majority of the covered sports medicine professional's practice is underwritten for medical professional liability insurance coverage.*

(9) *SECONDARY STATE.*—The term "secondary State" means, with respect to a covered sports medicine professional, any State that is not the primary State.

(10) *STATE.*—The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 921, the Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2016, introduced by my

colleague on the Health Subcommittee, BRETT GUTHRIE.

Team physicians and other licensed sports medicine professionals often travel with their athletes to away games and other sporting events outside of their home State. When providing care to an injured player during the game or in the locker room afterwards, they are often doing so at great personal and professional risk. If they are sued, their home State license could be in jeopardy, and their malpractice insurance may not provide coverage.

This commonsense bill would provide clarity first by stating that their liability insurance shall cover them outside their home State for limited services within the scope of their practice, subject to any related premium adjustments.

Second, to the extent that the healthcare professional is licensed under the requirements of their home State to provide certain services to an athlete or team, they shall be treated as satisfying corresponding licensure requirements of a secondary State in these narrowly defined instances.

H.R. 921 has almost 200 bipartisan cosponsors and is supported by a wide range of professional medical associations as well as amateur and professional sports associations. I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2016.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I write with respect to H.R. 921, the "Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act," which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 921 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 921 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 921 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 921.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2016.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 921, the "Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2015." As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo consideration of H.R. 921, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand that the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and you will have my support for any such request.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 921.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 921, the Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2015. The bill's sponsors, Congressman RICHMOND and Congressman GUTHRIE, were able to fix a particular problem with a targeted solution in this legislation.

As amended, this bill will ensure that sports medicine professionals who contract with a team are covered by their medical professional liability insurance while they are traveling with their teams. Medical licensure is State specific, so when a provider travels with a team, they are often technically practicing without a license and without their medical liability insurance. Obviously this is a problem.

This bill solves that problem unique to sports medicine professionals since they travel around the country with their teams. The legislation provides that any medical malpractice incident occurring under the care of a traveling team sports medicine professional would be treated as if it occurred in the professional's primary State of practice rather than the State in which the game is being played. This bill does not allow these providers to practice beyond the scope of their licenses or to treat athletes anywhere other than the field or the court.

This legislation will also provide certainty to players that malpractice insurance will apply if they need to file a lawsuit after receiving improper care. I am pleased that the sponsors were able to work with the Energy and Commerce Committee and stakeholders to ensure that this bill achieves the right balance.

I want to thank Congressman GUTHRIE and Congressman RICHMOND from Louisiana for working on this bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes." I

just, again, want to thank the sponsors for fixing a problem that clearly needed fixing. I support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this worthwhile bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 921, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

ADVANCED NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4979) to foster civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies and enhance the licensing and commercial deployment of such technologies, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4979

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Nuclear energy generates approximately 20 percent of the total electricity and approximately 60 percent of the carbon-free electricity of the United States.

(2) Nuclear power plants operate consistently at a 90 percent capacity factor, and provide consumers and businesses with reliable and affordable electricity.

(3) Nuclear power plants generate billions of dollars in national economic activity through nationwide procurements and provide thousands of Americans with high paying jobs contributing substantially to the local economies in communities where they operate.

(4) The United States commercial nuclear industry must continue to lead the international civilian nuclear marketplace, because it is one of our most powerful national security tools, guaranteeing the safe, secure, and exclusively peaceful use of nuclear energy.

(5) Maintaining the Nation's nuclear fleet of commercial light water reactors and expanding the use of new advanced reactor designs would support continued production of reliable baseload electricity and maintain United States global leadership in nuclear power.

(6) Nuclear fusion technology also has the potential to generate electricity with significantly increased safety performance and no radioactive waste.

(7) The development of advanced reactor designs would benefit from a performance-based, risk-informed, efficient, and cost-effective regulatory framework with defined milestones and the opportunity for applicants to demonstrate progress through Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR.**—The term “advanced nuclear reactor” means—

(A) a nuclear fission reactor with significant improvements over the most recent generation of nuclear fission reactors, which may include inherent safety features, lower waste yields, greater fuel utilization, superior reliability, resistance to proliferation, and increased thermal efficiency; or

(B) a nuclear fusion reactor.

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(3) **LICENSING.**—The term “licensing” means NRC activities related to reviewing applications for licenses, permits, and design certifications, and requests for any other regulatory approval for nuclear reactors within the responsibilities of the NRC under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(4) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

(5) **NRC.**—The term “NRC” means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 4. AGENCY COORDINATION.

The NRC and the Department shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the following topics:

(1) **TECHNICAL EXPERTISE.**—Ensuring that the Department has sufficient technical expertise to support the civilian nuclear industry’s timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of safe, innovative advanced reactor technology and the NRC has sufficient technical expertise to support the evaluation of applications for licenses, permits, and design certifications, and other requests for regulatory approval for advanced reactors.

(2) **MODELING AND SIMULATION.**—The use of computers and software codes to calculate the behavior and performance of advanced reactors based on mathematical models of their physical behavior.

(3) **FACILITIES.**—Ensuring that the Department maintains and develops the facilities to enable the civilian nuclear industry’s timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of safe, innovative reactor technology and ensuring that the NRC has access to such facilities, as needed.

SEC. 5. REPORTING TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Laboratories, relevant Federal agencies, and other stakeholders, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report assessing the capabilities of the Department to authorize, host, and oversee privately proposed and funded experimental reactors.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Such report shall address—

(1) the safety review and oversight capabilities of the Department, including options to leverage expertise from the NRC and the National Laboratories;

(2) options to regulate Department hosted, privately proposed and funded experimental reactors;

(3) potential sites capable of hosting the activities described in subsection (a);

(4) the efficacy of the available contractual mechanisms of the Department to partner with the private sector and other Federal agencies, including cooperative research and development agreements, strategic partnership projects, and agreements for commercializing technology;

(5) the Federal Government’s liability with respect to the disposal of low-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, or high-level radioactive waste, as defined by section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101);

(6) the impact on the Nation’s aggregate inventory of low-level radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, or high-level radioactive waste;

(7) potential cost structures relating to physical security, decommissioning, liability, and other long-term project costs; and

(8) other challenges or considerations identified by the Secretary.

(c) **UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall update relevant provisions of the report submitted under subsection (a) every 2 years and submit that update to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

SEC. 6. ADVANCED REACTOR REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the NRC shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a plan for developing an efficient, risk-informed, technology-neutral framework for advanced reactor licensing. The plan shall evaluate the following subjects, consistent with the NRC’s role in protecting public health and safety and common defense and security:

(1) The unique aspects of advanced reactor licensing and any associated legal, regulatory, and policy issues the NRC will need to address to develop a framework for licensing advanced reactors.

(2) Options for licensing advanced reactors under existing NRC regulations in title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, a proposed new regulatory framework, or a combination of these approaches.

(3) Options to expedite and streamline the licensing of advanced reactors, including opportunities to minimize the time from application submittal to final NRC licensing decision and minimize the delays that may result from any necessary amendments or supplements to applications.

(4) Options to expand the incorporation of consensus-based codes and standards into the advanced reactor regulatory framework to minimize time to completion and provide flexibility in implementation.

(5) Options to make the advanced reactor licensing framework more predictable. This evaluation should consider opportunities to improve the process by which application review milestones are established and maintained.

(6) Options to allow applicants to use phased review processes under which the NRC issues approvals that do not require the NRC to re-review previously approved information. This evaluation shall consider the NRC’s ability to review and conditionally approve partial applications, early design information, and submittals that contain design criteria and processes to be used to de-

velop information to support a later phase of the design review.

(7) The extent to which NRC action or modification of policy is needed to implement any part of the plan required by this subsection.

(8) The role of licensing advanced reactors within NRC long-term strategic resource planning, staffing, and funding levels.

(9) Options to provide cost-sharing financial structures for license applicants in a phased licensing process.

(b) **COORDINATION AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT REQUIRED.**—In developing the plan required by subsection (a), the NRC shall seek input from the Department, the nuclear industry, and other public stakeholders.

(c) **COST AND SCHEDULE ESTIMATE.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include proposed cost estimates, budgets, and specific milestones for implementing the advanced reactor regulatory framework by September 30, 2019.

(d) **DESIGN CERTIFICATION STATUS.**—In the NRC’s first budget request after the acceptance of any design certification application for an advanced nuclear reactor, and annually thereafter, the NRC shall provide the status of performance metrics and milestone schedules. The budget request shall include a plan to correct or recover from any milestone schedule delays, including delays because of NRC’s inability to commit resources for its review of the design certification applications.

SEC. 7. USER FEES AND ANNUAL CHARGES.

Section 6101(c)(2)(A) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214(c)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (iii);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) for fiscal years ending before October 1, 2020, amounts appropriated to the Commission for activities related to the development of regulatory infrastructure for advanced nuclear reactor technologies.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4979, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016, which I introduced with Congressman MCNERNEY earlier this year. We are very excited the bill received unanimous support of the full Energy and Commerce Committee.

The next generation of the nuclear industry needs to start now, with Congress ensuring that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is able to provide

the certainty that the private sector needs to invest in innovative technologies. Nuclear power is currently 20 percent of our national energy portfolio, and it must remain a vital part of our energy mix. As the United States looks to the future, more energy will be needed, and nuclear power provides a reliable, clean baseload power option, currently providing approximately 63 percent of total carbon-free energy.

It is imperative that we develop the right regulatory framework so advanced nuclear technologies can be developed, licensed, and constructed here in the United States. If we miss the opportunity to establish a safe, predictable regulatory framework for these technologies, private innovators and entrepreneurs will take their investment and scientists to our competitors in the global market.

H.R. 4979 requires that NRC establish a regulatory framework for issuing licenses for advanced nuclear reactor technology and also requires that NRC submit a schedule for implementation of the framework by 2019. Safety in nuclear is the number one goal, and this regulatory framework ensures that NRC has the opportunity to develop a framework to safely regulate the future technologies of the nuclear industry.

H.R. 4979 also requires that the Department of Energy and the NRC collaborate in developing new nuclear technology. DOE and its National Laboratories provide opportunities to test new private sector nuclear technologies. This bill would direct DOE to look at options for public-private partnerships between the DOE and the private sector companies interested in investing in the future of nuclear. There is also a role for NRC in this space because these testing opportunities may allow for demonstration of technologies that NRC has not commercially licensed for over the last 40 years.

Investment in new technologies is already happening, with approximately 50 companies in this country investing over \$1 billion to develop the next generation of nuclear power. That is why we introduced H.R. 4979. It is time for Congress to ensure that NRC provides a framework so that innovators and investors can prepare to apply for licensing technologies. Passing this legislation is key to ensure that the United States remains a leader in the nuclear industry, which is vital for both our electricity mix and our national security.

I want to thank all of the cosponsors of this bill, as well as Chairman UPTON and Congressman MCNERNEY and all of the staff and stakeholders for their work on this important legislation.

I urge full support from my colleagues for H.R. 4979.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4979, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016, introduced by our

colleagues Mr. LATTA of Ohio and Mr. MCNERNEY of California. As subcommittee ranker of Environment and the Economy that reports to the standing committee of Energy and Commerce, I am proud to support this legislation.

H.R. 4979 would require the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to enter into a memorandum of understanding to ensure technical expertise is maintained to assist in the development of advanced nuclear technology. The legislation would also require the NRC to establish a framework for issuing licenses for advanced reactor technology.

Nuclear technology has been largely unchanged for decades. Having our experts coordinate is the best way to support the private sector's development of new technology that may advance the industry in terms of waste, in terms of efficiency, and in terms of safety.

Regardless of Members' position on nuclear energy, I believe there is unanimous agreement that there is no compromising when it comes to safety. We need high standards for safety, and I believe and hope that the enhanced cooperation between DOE and NRC required by this bill will help put safety front and center for the development of advanced nuclear technology.

I congratulate Mr. LATTA and Mr. MCNERNEY for their work on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank my friend and colleague from Texas, Chairman BURGESS, for yielding me time.

H.R. 4979, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016, gives direction to cooperative civilian nuclear energy R&D and provides regulatory changes to advance commercial innovation in the American nuclear power industry.

I thank the chairman of the committee on Energy and Commerce, my good friend, FRED UPTON, for his leadership and for working with me on this shared legislation.

I am encouraged by the strong bipartisan support that has emerged for nuclear energy innovation, beginning with the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's House-passed Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, H.R. 4084. That bill is part of both the energy policy and NDAA conferences going on right now.

H.R. 4084, sponsored by the Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Energy Chairman RANDY WEBER and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, already has passed the House this Congress with strong bipartisan support. The reinforcing legislation we consider today continues this

bipartisan work. I thank the sponsors of today's bill, Representatives BOB LATTA and JERRY MCNERNEY, for their initiative on this issue.

Advanced nuclear energy technology provides an opportunity to make reliable, emission-free electricity available throughout the modern and developing world. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has held many hearings and worked steadily on nuclear innovation since December 2014.

I thank Chairman UPTON, in particular, for being willing to incorporate important provisions in today's bill that were developed by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee through our continued work on nuclear R&D in our jurisdiction. I also appreciate Chairman UPTON's acceptance of language to ensure that the Department of Energy focuses on research and development that enables private sector commercialization efforts.

Nuclear power has been a proven source of safe and emission-free electricity for over half a century. America's strategic investments in advanced nuclear reactor technology can help create economic growth here and an improved quality of life around the globe.

Unfortunately, government red tape has stalled the ability to move innovative technology to the market. This legislation requires the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to provide a plan for developing a more efficient way to regulate new nuclear technology.

In July 2015, the chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission testified before the Science, Space, and Technology Committee on this very issue. Congress must take action to ensure that the NRC reviews, assists, and approves advanced reactor technologies. If not, the United States will be forced to import nuclear technologies from overseas. America must lead the world in nuclear technology for our energy security and national security.

I thank the sponsors for their work on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), a friend, colleague, and fellow engineer on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for that introduction. I also want to thank Mr. LATTA for his work on this. He moved forward and asked me to participate. I thought it was a good plan, so I did.

As our country works to mitigate the effects of climate change and prepare for the energy challenges of the future, we must now move to develop low- and zero-carbon energy sources. This means making investments into R&D, training the scientists, engineers, and mathematicians of tomorrow, and ensuring there is an appropriate regulatory and investment framework that will foster growth as new technologies become commercially viable.

Nuclear energy has been a reliable source of energy, producing a significant amount of our Nation's energy supply, and it will likely do so into the future. But building plants and developing new technologies takes time, and we need to take steps to ensure the regulatory tools, including safety and reliability, are in place to meet potential increases in nuclear power capacity.

H.R. 4979 is a commonsense approach that provides a pathway for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to establish the proper regulatory framework to facilitate, verify, and permit advanced reactor technologies. This bill also fosters increased collaborations between the NRC and the National Laboratories to provide opportunities to test new nuclear energy technologies and bolster public-private partnerships.

The provisions in this bill are aligned with the NRC's fiscal year 2017 budget request.

As we move forward toward a low-carbon sustainable energy economy, nuclear energy has the potential to play an instrumental role in meeting both State and national goals. Our current nuclear reactors use light water reactor technology, but there are advances that move toward completely different technology, including small modular reactors that can increase efficiency and safety while reducing the permitting and construction requirements that have hampered the development of new nuclear plants in recent years.

The bill passed unanimously out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and has support from nearly a dozen organizations, and I urge its passage.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4979, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016, to talk about what it means for our Nation's energy infrastructure needs.

Energy independence is a critical goal for the United States as the sources of energy available in this country grow and become safer. It has been proven that nuclear energy is an extremely safe and viable option with the only new nuclear plant in 30 years being built just up the river from my district. There has been a considerable amount of research and development that has gone in to nuclear energy, and it accounts for 60 percent of the clean energy produced in the United States.

Under this bill, those hurdles to design and development will be lowered to ensure that the option to produce clean, viable energy that is stable and sustainable remains a possibility.

Growing a closer partnership between the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will help to chart an energy-independent path for our Nation as we seek new possibilities

and alternatives to power our way to a better future. This legislation will knock down those walls to innovation and will provide an opportunity to develop advanced reactor designs that could be vital to our energy infrastructure.

I applaud my good friend, Mr. LATTA, for his work on this issue and the work of the Energy and Commerce Committee to address these reforms to the nuclear energy field and energy independence.

I urge passage of this important legislation.

□ 1830

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I will just again reinforce what I think is a strong benefit here: bringing into the industry the efforts for resourcefulness, for efficiency, and for safety, all very key elements to this sector of the energy economy. The bill bears great benefits for the consumers of this country. I strongly support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the passage of this bill and the future of our nuclear technology industry. I urge an "aye" vote.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND
TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, September 8, 2016.

Hon. FRED UPTON,

Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 4979, the "Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016," which your Committee ordered reported on May 18, 2016.

H.R. 4979 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,

Washington, DC, September 8, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,

Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4979, the "Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act of 2016."

As you noted, H.R. 4979 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space,

and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, and I agree that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4979, the Advanced Nuclear Technology Development Act, and to talk about what it means for our nation's energy infrastructure needs.

Energy independence is a critical goal for the United States as the sources of energy available in this country grow and become safer.

It's been proven that nuclear energy is an extremely safe and viable option with the only new nuclear plant in 30 years being built just up the river from my district.

There has been a considerable amount of research and development that has gone in to the nuclear energy and it accounts for 60 percent of the clean energy produced in the United States.

Under this bill, those hurdles to design and development will be lowered to ensure that the option to produce clean, viable energy that is stable and sustainable remains a possibility.

Growing a closer partnership between the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will help to chart an energy independence path for our nation as we seek new possibilities and alternatives to power our way to a better future.

This legislation will knock down those walls to innovation and will provide an opportunity to develop advanced reactor designs that could be vital to our energy infrastructure.

I applaud my good friend Mr. LATTA for his work on this issue and the work of the Energy and Commerce Committee to address these reforms to the nuclear energy field and energy independence and I urge passage of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4979, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 847, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 835, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE ABOUT A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives about a national strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 4, answered “present” 1, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

YEAS—367

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fleming
Adams	Clay	Flores
Aderholt	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Aguilar	Clyburn	Foster
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amodei	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Ashford	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Babin	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Fudge
Barr	Comstock	Gabbard
Beatty	Conaway	Galleo
Benishhek	Connolly	Garamendi
Bera	Conyers	Garrett
Beyer	Cook	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Cooper	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Courtney	Gosar
Black	Cramer	Gowdy
Blackburn	Crawford	Graham
Blum	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Bonamici	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Bost	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Cummings	Grayson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davidson	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	Davis, Danny	Griffith
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Grijalva
Bridenstine	DeFazio	Hahn
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Hanna
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Hardy
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Harper
Buchanan	Denham	Harris
Buck	Dent	Hartzler
Bucshon	DeSantis	Hastings
Burgess	DeSaulnier	Heck (NV)
Bustos	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Byrne	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Calvert	Dingell	Herrera Beutler
Capps	Doggett	Hice, Jody B.
Capuano	Dold	Higgins
Cárdenas	Donovan	Hill
Carney	Duffy	Himes
Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hinojosa
Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Carter (TX)	Edwards	Honda
Cartwright	Ellison	Hudson
Castor (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Emmer (MN)	Hultgren
Chabot	Engel	Hunter
Chaffetz	Esty	Hurd (TX)
Chu, Judy	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Clark (MA)	Farr	Israel
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Issa
	Fleischmann	Jeffries

Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (WV)	Moulton	Scott, David
Johnson (GA)	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Sessions
Jolly	Murphy (PA)	Sherman
Jones	Nadler	Shimkus
Jordan	Napolitano	Shuster
Joyce	Neal	Simpson
Katko	Neugebauer	Sinema
Keating	Newhouse	Sires
Kelly (IL)	Noem	Slaughter
Kelly (MS)	Norcross	Smith (MO)
Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Smith (NE)
Kennedy	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	O'Rourke	Smith (TX)
Kilmer	Olson	Smith (WA)
Kind	Pallone	Speier
King (IA)	Palmer	Stefanik
King (NY)	Paulsen	Stewart
Kinzing (IL)	Pearce	Stivers
Kline	Perlmuter	Swalwell (CA)
Knight	Perry	Takano
Kuster	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Labrador	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
LaHood	Pingree	Thompson (PA)
LaMalfa	Pittenger	Thornberry
Lamborn	Pitts	Tiberi
Lance	Pocan	Tipton
Langevin	Poliquin	Titus
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Tonko
Latta	Pompeo	Torres
Lieu, Ted	Posey	Trott
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Tsongas
LoBiondo	Price, Tom	Turner
Loeback	Quigley	Upton
Lofgren	Rangel	Valadao
Long	Ratcliffe	Van Hollen
Loudermilk	Reed	Vargas
Love	Reichert	Veasey
Lowenthal	Renacci	Vela
Lucas	Ribble	Visclosky
Luetkemeyer	Rice (NY)	Wagner
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rigell	Walberg
Lummis	Roby	Walden
Lynch	Roe (TN)	Walorski
MacArthur	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (KY)	Walz
Marino	Rokita	Wasserman
Matsui	Rooney (FL)	Schultz
McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson Coleman
McCauley	Roskam	Weber (TX)
McClintock	Ross	Webster (FL)
McDermott	Rothfus	Wenstrup
McGovern	Rouzer	Westerman
McHenry	Royce	Westmoreland
McKinley	Ruiz	Williams
McMorris	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Rodgers	Russell	Wilson (SC)
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
McSally	Salmon	Womack
Meadows	Sánchez, Linda T.	Woodall
Meehan	T.	Yarmuth
Meeks	Sanford	Yoder
Messer	Sarbanes	Yoho
Mica	Scalise	Young (AK)
Miller (FL)	Schrader	Young (IA)
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Zeldin
	Scott (VA)	Zinke

NAYS—4

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

NOT VOTING—59

Amash	Huelskamp
Grothman	Massie
	Rice (SC)
Barton	Hoyer
Bass	Huizenga (MI)
Becerra	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Kaptur
Butterfield	Kirkpatrick
Ciilline	Larson (CT)
Crenshaw	Lawrence
Davis (CA)	Lee
DeGette	Levin
DesJarlais	Lewis
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowe
Duckworth	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Eshoo	Maloney, Carolyn
Forcher	Marchant
Forbes	McCollum
Granger	Meng
Guinta	Miller (MI)
Guthrie	Moore
Gutiérrez	

□ 1853

Messrs. MASSIE, HUELSKAMP, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 496.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 496.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 496.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING A NATIONAL POLICY FOR TECHNOLOGY TO PROMOTE CONSUMERS' ACCESS TO FINANCIAL TOOLS AND ON-LINE COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 835) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt a national policy for technology to promote consumers' access to financial tools and online commerce to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 4, answered “present” 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—385

Abraham	Boyle, Brendan F.	Chabot
Adams	Brady (PA)	Chaffetz
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Chu, Judy
Aguilar	Brat	Clark (MA)
Allen	Bridenstine	Clarke (NY)
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Clawson (FL)
Ashford	Brooks (IN)	Clay
Babin	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Barletta	Buchanan	Clyburn
Barr	Buck	Coffman
Bass	Bucshon	Cohen
Beatty	Burgess	Cole
Becerra	Bustos	Collins (GA)
Benishhek	Byrne	Collins (NY)
Bera	Calvert	Comstock
Beyer	Capps	Conaway
Bilirakis	Capuano	Connolly
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Conyers
Bishop (MI)	Carney	Cook
Bishop (UT)	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Black	Carter (GA)	Costa
Blackburn	Carter (TX)	Costello (PA)
Blum	Cartwright	Courtney
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Cramer
Bost	Castro (TX)	Crawford
Boustany		Crowley

Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce

Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loftgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—4

Amash
Grothman

Huelskamp
Massie

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—41

Barton
Blumenauer
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Cicilline
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Forbes

Garamendi
Granger
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Huizenga (MI)
Jackson Lee
Johnson, Sam
Kirkpatrick
Lawrence
Marchant
Meng
Miller (MI)
Nolan

Palazzo
Pascarell
Payne
Poe (TX)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Sewell (AL)
Stutzman
Walker
Young (IN)

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATIONS, MINNETONKA SCHOOLS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to recognize the Minnetonka School District for being named the number one school district in Minnesota by Niche, a Web site that analyzes education data across the country. The Minnetonka School District has received an overall A-plus grade based on their excellence in several areas, including academics, educational outcomes, teachers, and extracurricular opportunities. The school district received an A grade or higher in 9 out of 10 different categories considered in the analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the teachers and the administrators of the Minnetonka schools for their commitment to going above and beyond in educating students from preschool to graduation. By dedicating themselves to providing an enriching learning environment, these educators are equipping students with all the necessary tools to not only excel in the classroom but also contribute to leadership on sports teams, clubs, and in our community.

We are proud to have such an exemplary school system in our own backyard. Congratulations to the teachers, the students, the administrators, and the parents of Minnetonka for this distinguished recognition.

FEDERAL FUNDING WILL COMBAT WHITE-NOSE SYNDROME

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know that I join a large number of my colleagues here in the House in concern over the white-nose syndrome. It is a devastating fungus that has killed between 5.7 million and 6.7 million bats across North America.

Recently, I received news of grant funding from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to combat this disease and that Pennsylvania will receive more than \$30,000.

As a member of the House Committee on Natural Resources, I have been active in ensuring the effects of white-nose syndrome were appropriately addressed. I have participated in field hearings on the subject and toured habitats where bat populations have been devastated by this fungus. There is an ecological importance to sustaining the bat population as well as preventing the species from becoming endangered, which would cause great harm to resource production, agriculture, and construction across the Commonwealth and a large part of the country.

A rule finalized in 2015, which listed the northern long-eared bat, cleared the way for new conservation practices to be put in place where necessary, helping make new conservation measures possible without broadly prohibiting common land-use activities. It is my hope that these measures will help us in the effort against white-nose syndrome.

UNDERWATER RESOURCE MAPPING

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss recent developments in the area of underwater resource mapping. Scientists at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography used NSF funding to develop instruments to conduct marine electromagnetic surveys. This technology uses electrical currents and conduction to search for freshwater aquifers in the ocean, which will reveal the location of drinking water supplies deep below the surface of the sea.

It has been clear to scientists for 40 years that bodies of freshwater exist off the U.S. East Coast. This research created the only noninvasive method capable of sensing the exact location of these valuable drinking water reserves.

This technology has also attracted the attention of oil companies, which continue to develop the Scripps system to map out underwater resource deposits in three dimensions across the globe. Important projects like these improve our search for natural resources, and I commend the Scripps Institution and the National Science Foundation.

SEPTEMBER 11 TRIBUTE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th anniversary of the murderous attacks of September 11, former Vice President Dick Cheney with Liz Cheney detailed how the next President will face greater risks to American families and a weaker military than ever before, in an op-ed published in *The Wall Street Journal*, with the President's legacy of weakness:

"The President who came into office promising to end wars has made war more likely by diminishing America's strength and deterrence ability. He doesn't seem to understand that the credible threat of military force gives substance and meaning to our diplomacy . . .

"Among the most important lessons of 9/11 was that terrorists must be denied safe havens from which to plan and launch attacks against us. On President Obama's watch, terrorist safe havens have expanded around the globe . . .

"Generations before have met and defeated grave threats to our great Nation. American strength, leadership, and ideals were crucial to the Allied victory in World War II and the defeat of Soviet communism during the cold war. It will be up to today's generation to restore American preeminence so that we can defend our freedom and defeat Islamic terror."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER DEPUTY BRANDON COLLINS

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today truly saddened. I rise to speak the name of a slain police officer in our community for the third time in just a few short months. Johnson County Sheriff Master Deputy Brandon Collins was hit by a car while making a traffic stop early Sunday morning and tragically killed.

He leaves behind his wife and two daughters, who are suffering an unimaginable loss. Deputy Collins was only 44 years old and was just about to celebrate his 21st year with his department serving our community.

Brooke and I want to extend our deepest condolences to his family and friends. You are all, and will remain, in our thoughts and prayers.

As we mourn with our entire community, Deputy Collins' death is a devastating reminder, especially in light of yesterday being the 15th anniversary of the attacks on September 11, that our first responders risk their lives all

the time to protect us and keep us safe. We owe them a debt of gratitude we will never be able to repay.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless Deputy Collins, and may he rest in peace.

A DAY SEARED INTO OUR MEMORY

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, September 11, is a day that will live in our memory forever. For those old enough to remember Pearl Harbor, that was a day that was seared into their memory. For those in the early 1960s, November 1963, the day that President Kennedy was shot will live in their memory forever. Everyone remembers where they were when they heard the news.

But September 11, 2001, was a day that changed our world forever. Ultimately, we know that on that day, as the first plane hit the World Trade Center, we thought it was a terrible accident. When the second plane came in and hit that tower, we knew that it was something vastly different. We were under attack, and, frankly, our way of life was under attack.

We are trained, Mr. Speaker, as young children to run away from danger, but our first responders are trained the opposite—to run towards it. And so that fateful day, as people were exiting the World Trade Center, we had our first responders who were running in to try to save as many people as possible.

What was also interesting is that on Flight 93, we had citizens on that plane who realized what was going on as they got word to their loved ones and put the lives of Americans in front of their own. That plane was coming, most likely, to this building right here, Mr. Speaker.

So on the day after September 11, I want to make sure that Americans realize that we thank our first responders, and we thank those who are in uniform, those in our intelligence community who are trying to protect and save the United States of America from ever experiencing that type of attack again.

Again, God bless America. God bless our first responders and those in uniform.

□ 1915

9/11 ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday being the 15th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks, I just wanted to commend the people of northern California, of my district, for the efforts they made to remember that and to also say thank you to our

firefighters all up and down the district.

The city of Chico had much positive participation as well, starting in the morning with the Optimist Club of Oroville and Chico saying, Let's take the firefighters to breakfast. They did so. There was a lot of great participation on that. It was one way to start the day—by saying thank you again to our first responders.

The city of Chico, along with their fire department, led by Chief Bill Hack, was able to have a very, very moving and well-done 9/11 commemoration starting at the Elks Club because the fire station was no longer large enough to house all the people that were participating, which is a good thing. They used great solemnity to honor the firefighters that were lost 15 years ago as well as remembering that those first responders need to be respected and properly taken care of.

We commend, again, the city of Chico and the fire department for making the community part of this, culminating in the bell-ringing at the 9/11 Memorial they have onsite at Station 5.

And there was a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the brand new building they have with a 9/11 memorial inside as well.

God bless our first responders and our firefighters. Good job, city of Chico, for making the 15th anniversary of 9/11 a good public event.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

SEPTEMBER 12, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 214(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20944), I hereby appoint Dr. Philip B. Stark of Berkeley, California to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission Board of Advisors.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

SEPTEMBER 12, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Steven L. Roberts of St. Louis, Missouri to the Congressional Award Board.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

LAMEDUCK SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you on the floor of the House of Representatives this evening, as we move toward a September session that perhaps gets concluded in a way that we go back to the November elections and, hopefully, we are bridged over any great big decisions that might come in a lameduck session.

Something that I wanted to address to you, Mr. Speaker, is the circumstances of lameduck sessions. I look back on the history of them and it is hard for me to find happy conclusions that are drawn during lameduck sessions.

I recall that Thomas Jefferson once made the statement that "large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities." What he meant by that was, if you have a large initiative and it is going to move this country and it is going to stress a lot of people in this country, then, if you move that large initiative and its margins are essentially close to a jump ball, you are going to have almost half the people unhappy—maybe more than half the people who are unhappy.

So that large initiative should not be advanced on a slender majority, because you get so much pushback, you don't get public buy-in. If you have a large initiative, you need to have a public that embraces it; one that, hopefully, we can get to a supermajority on large initiatives, because then we go forward in lockstep in defending and promoting those decisions that were made by this country.

Worse than advancing a large decision on a slender majority is pushing large decisions in lameduck sessions. The reality of it is, however long and nobly Members of the House and Members of the Senate have served and however long and nobly the President of the United States may have served, when they are leaving town after the election, for them to come back here after the November election and push large initiatives in a lameduck session, they are not held accountable for it any longer. You have the people that are retiring, those that we voted out of office, and a President who is term-limited altogether packaging things up and shoving them at us, the American people, sometime after November 8 and before Christmas, where we have cliffhangers that go on until Christmas Eve.

I remember Christmas Eve in about 2009. In fact, it was 2009. The

ObamaCare legislation was hanging in the balance in the United States Senate. There, I recall my communications with the esteemed gentleman who is now the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I said: Procedurally, you are down to the last piece here. This is the eve of Christmas Eve day, December 23.

I had sent an email over, which often and almost immediately is responded to by my senior Senator, and I said: Procedurally, you are going to hold ObamaCare until 9 o'clock tomorrow night on Christmas Eve. But it looks like the question is: Will the ObamaCare legislation be brought before the Senate before—earlier in the morning on the 24th—so that everybody can catch their plane and fly back home and get home in time for Christmas?

The price for sacrificing God-given American liberty to move a leftist agenda, Mr. Speaker, was what was going on over in the Senate. They brought this leverage right up until Christmas Eve day. But the deal was they had a couple of judicial appointments that they wanted to get in a vote on, as I understood, that could come along in January, as a promise that they allowed the ObamaCare legislation to be voted on before 9 o'clock on December 24, Christmas Eve day.

That agreement was reached and the Senate conferenced in some negotiated fashion or another and the last delay that was hanging onto God-given American liberty in the face of ObamaCare's hook, crook, and legislative shenanigans, which they used to pass that through the House and Senate—in components, by the way—the last one was removed and they allowed that vote earlier in the day so the Senators could get to the airport, get on a plane, fly home, and be with their families on Christmas Eve.

I said: If you are going to take away a God-given American liberty, then make them pay that price. Hold that vote up until 9 o'clock on Christmas Eve. Let them stay in Washington, D.C., on Christmas Eve. If they love their socialized medicine that much, let them pay that price of being away from their families to impose that on the American people.

But that wasn't the agreement. So I sent the email back, which said: What are we going to do now?

The answer I received was: We are going to pray. We are going to pray for a legislative victory in the special election in the Senate race in Massachusetts. Scott Brown.

I thought that was a bit of a reach, to have the audacity to ask for that. We ended up with that. Scott Brown, for a time, did delay the socialized medicine program that we call ObamaCare. George Washington could not have called it the Affordable Care Act because George Washington could not tell a lie. It is not the Affordable Care Act.

It came upon us in a lameduck session. Probably the worst example of a

lameduck session that we have seen. Well, at least it was a December session rather than a lameduck session because it technically was not an election year.

Now we are sitting in an election year. We will elect a new President. By the time the sun comes on the morning of November 9, odds are we will know clearly who the next President of the United States is going to be. We will probably have a good idea that evening before we go to bed. Maybe the polls will give us a strong indication going into that day and the exit polls during the day will be released as the polls close and give us a sense of how this thing breaks across the country.

It is an exciting time. Whether the next President of the United States is going to be Hillary Clinton or whether it is going to be Donald Trump is a question that no one at this point knows. Now, this Congress will take conclusive acts predicated upon a presumption of one or the other, or, acting as if they don't have any consideration for who will be the next President and asking that those decisions be made, supported, ratified by people who are going home, retired by their own choice, retired by the voters, or retired, in the case of Barack Obama, by term limits.

So what good could possibly happen in a lameduck session on large decisions that might bring forward—and I am not going down through the list, Mr. Speaker, because if I do that, that will add to the level of expectation on what might come.

It is wrong for this Congress to make large decisions, especially on slender majorities, and it is wrong for this Congress to make decisions that are predicated by a presumption of who will be the next President of the United States. And it is really wrong to come into this Congress and make big decisions in here while people are on the way out the door; deciding votes while they are on the way out the door to go home for their retirement, whether it is by choice, whether it is by the voters, or by constitutional term limit, whatever the case may be. That lameduck session should be used only to do that which couldn't be accomplished before the election and that which must be done before the new Congress is sworn in in the first week of January 2017.

We have that period of time. We can prepare for that. But it looks to me like there are some people in this Congress who are salivating over the idea of being able to exercise more leverage by moving an agenda through in a lameduck session that will be at the disadvantage of the will of the voters.

If you can't put that up here on the floor for a vote in the House of Representatives between now and November 8; if you can't sell it to the American people, Democrats and Republicans; if you can't get the support of one of the likely next Presidents of the United States, then who are we to impose it on the American people now?

By the way, who is the current President, Barack Obama, to be negotiating and leveraging and reaching legislative agreements with the House of Representatives and the Senate today on legislation that would not be signed by the next President and legislation that can't be subjected to the light of day prior to the election?

Lameduck sessions that move large initiatives are wrong. Lameduck sessions that take care of emergency issues are okay. The public will know the difference between the two.

This is just a component of the discussions that we will have the rest of this month of September, Mr. Speaker, and, hopefully, the American people will have all the way up until November 8 and beyond.

I want the American people to be well informed. We owe the American people—every one of us, all 435 of here in the House of Representatives—everyone around this Chamber here tonight and everyone who is watching on C-SPAN, Mr. Speaker, our best efforts and our best judgment, and that judgment should not be something that can't be subjected to theirs. The American people need to agree with the judgment of the United States Congress.

So I look at the issues that are unfolding here and that we will be taking up perhaps in the month of September, but also issues that have been seminal issues all along, throughout the Obama Presidency and prior to that and all the time I have been in this Congress, and I am seeing the pressure come forward to make a decision on a continuing resolution. We have to make a decision on a continuing resolution—a CR, as we refer to it here.

I would like to have seen this Congress go through regular order. I would have been very happy to go back to the times that I remember when we had 12 appropriations bill, perhaps a supplemental appropriations bill—maybe 13, at the most—and we would see that our Appropriations subcommittees would do their work and the Appropriations Committee would do its work. And then the appropriations bill would come to the floor. They would come to the floor within the Budget Committee's resolution and the House's vote on a full resolution of the budget.

Once that budget comes down, the Appropriations Committee goes to work and they look and see what their allocation is allowed in the budget resolution and they move the appropriations bills within that. Then the appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker, come to this floor under an open rule. I don't care if it takes all night for us to debate appropriations bills. If you don't care enough to stay up all night to offer your amendment, then just don't offer your amendment. Let somebody that cares more do that and have that floor. But Democrats and Republicans should be allowed to and have the opportunity to weigh in on every spending bill that we have.

□ 1930

And sometimes through the appropriations process is the only way that we end up with an open rule that allows a Member to bring the will of their constituents to the floor of the House of Representatives. Otherwise, the Rules Committee constrains that on policy bill after policy bill, standing bill after standing bill.

The appropriations process is our opportunity to reflect the voice and the will of the American people. And when that is subverted, when that is circumvented, when we get to a place where we don't have the regular appropriations process that is going on, then we end up with leadership negotiating a continuing resolution or an omnibus spending bill or a minibus spending bill that is packaged up in a room somewhere, not out in the open, but it doesn't have the opportunity to be amended in the process by the will of the Membership.

The more that process is narrowed down, and when a Member of Congress is required to go up to the Rules Committee and subject themselves to what can be a less than complimentary scenario of pleading with the Rules Committee for them to allow you to amend a spending bill up or down, or strike a spending line in there, or eliminate some policy, all within the rules that are there, why does a Member of the United States Congress whose constituents deserve every bit as much representation as the constituents of the leadership, or the constituents of the members of the Rules Committee, Democrat and Republicans, why does that Member of Congress have to go up and make that request to have an opportunity to make their argument to ask this floor to vote on an issue that funds or defunds policy? When we get to that point, the voice of the people, Mr. Speaker, is muted, and the will of the people, then, when it is muted, the will of the people is not carried out.

I am all for open debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I am for open debate in committees. Let's have a verbal donnybrook here. Over time, it sorts itself out, and the will of the people is designed to bring itself forward here in the United States Congress.

I would suggest also that, from a leadership perspective, anybody that holds a gavel, and whether that is the Speaker's gavel, Mr. Speaker, or whether it is a gavel of a committee or a subcommittee, wherever that might be, the job of that leader—chairman, usually—is to bring out the will of the group, not to impose their will on the group, but to bring out the will of the group.

So when I see this discussion that comes forward here in this Congress that contemplates a CR, a continuing resolution, of roughly 90 days or so that funds our Federal Government out till December 9, I look at the calendar, December 9, and I think, okay, that is just about how long it is going to take

for them to bring pressure on people that are reluctant to agree with the CR that will come then, because people will want to go home for Christmas, just like they did when ObamaCare was passed over in the United States Senate. That is what we are looking at. December 9, tight little time there. Get done, compromise, go home for Christmas. That is what that says to me.

I would say, instead, I am all right with a CR. I am all right with a continuing resolution. No, I don't want to fund any of the President's unconstitutional executive amnesty acts, and I don't want to fund Planned Parenthood. There are a number of things I don't want to fund.

But as far as the decision to move the funding of this Federal Government from midnight December 30 to a date in the future, I would suggest that that date be January 31, probably not any later than February 28, because we need to get that, bridge that funding over into the next Congress for the next President, whomever that might be.

It is time to do this transition and move this government to the next Congress, to the next—hopefully, it is the same majority. It may not be in the House. Hopefully, it is the same majority in the United States Senate. It may not be in the Senate.

The next President will be a different President, and the will of the President does itself upon the will of this Congress. We have been very much subjected to that over the last almost 8 years, Mr. Speaker.

It has been an object of clarity that when the House majority has decided not to fund, let's just say, at least one of the President's projects and the President has said, I will shut this government down first before I will be denied the funding for my pet projects, in the end, the majority in the House of Representatives capitulated to the will of the President.

We have that to contemplate going forward into the next Presidency. We have watched as the power of the House of Representatives has been diminished. The power of the Senate has been diminished and, I will say, significantly and dramatically. And it didn't just happen under this Presidency. It began in a significant way clear back in the thirties. I don't know the exact year that the Administrative Procedure Act was signed, but that would be, probably, a pivotal moment that one could point to on the calendar and conclude that the balance of the three branches of government that we had—that was designed by our Founding Fathers, and I would submit that the judiciary branch was always designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government.

But our Founding Fathers envisioned that those three branches in government—thinking of it in a triangle, Mr. Speaker: the legislative branch, Article I; the executive branch, Article II; and then the judicial branch, Article III of

your Constitution—they set them up to be a balance of powers, a triangular balance of powers. And even though it is often taught that it is three equal branches of government, I would argue that the legislative branch comes first—that is Article I—because we are the voice of the people.

The House of Representatives comes ahead of the Senate when it comes to spending, by design, by Constitution, because our Founding Fathers wanted to give the control of the power of the purse into the hands of the people as closely as they could possibly get it. And that is why we here in the House are up for election or reelection every 2 years and why the Senate is up for election or reelection every 6 years, because they wanted the Senate to be insulated from the highs and lows of public opinion.

They wanted the House of Representatives to be reactive and responsive to the highs and lows of public opinion, and they wanted that power of the purse to be in the hands of the House, so that we start the spending bills. By extension and by interpolation and by precedent, the House starts the spending, and the House takes care of initiating any taxes as well; and the Senate then can react to those things that are advanced by the House.

But if there is a single spending bill over in the Senate right now, they have expanded in authority, historically, to be able to simply add anything spending to that spending bill they would like. And we are poised here in the House wondering: Are they going to send us a bill that is this continuing resolution that fits their wants, their wishes, and their will, which could be a CR till December 9 that funds Planned Parenthood and ObamaCare and the President's executive amnesty? All of that could come at us, Mr. Speaker.

This balance of powers that is here, though, it was expected by our Founding Fathers, they believed that the people elected to serve in the Congress, the House and the Senate, and they believed that the President of the United States would all jealously protect the constitutional authority that is granted to them within the Constitution.

They knew that no matter how good wordsmiths they were, it was impossible to define the distinctions, the bright lines between the three branches of government in such a way that there would never be an argument because, after all, words themselves get into a debate on what the definitions of those words mean.

So our Founding Fathers precisely drew the difference as much as they could within the language that they had. And the data at the time, and the Federalist papers at the time, and the decisions that were made and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that was debated along the way, and of all of the debates that had to do with the Constitutional Convention helped flesh out the meaning and understanding of this great and

wonderful Constitution that we have. But they also knew that, no matter how precisely they fleshed it out, that there would be disagreements, and they expected that each branch of government would jealously protect the power and authority granted to it within the Constitution.

Well, this House of Representatives, and the Senate included, has not done a very good job of protecting and defending the authority and the power granted to it in the Constitution. Article I authority says all legislation shall be conducted in the United States Congress—all legislation, Mr. Speaker. And yet we have a President who has legislated from the Oval Office. He has legislated by speaking words into law. He has legislated by a third-tier Web site in the U.S. Treasury that essentially amended the effectiveness of ObamaCare.

This Congress didn't step up in the way of that and take on that fight and challenge the President and ball up this government to the point where the President had to give in to the words in the Constitution, the meaning of the Constitution, the intent of the Constitution, and concede that the power and the authority in the House of Representatives, in particular, but in the legislative branch, would assert itself over the executive branch. It didn't happen because of a lack of will at the House of Representatives to better define the legislative authority that we have.

It began, as I mentioned, with the Administrative Procedure Act, which granted rulemaking authority to the executive branch of government. And so rules, rules that once they meet the criteria that are defined within the Administrative Procedure Act—publish it, open it up for public comment, go through those conditions—if that rule as proposed reaches those conditions, then that rule is then enacted, implemented, and it has the force and effect of law as if it were law.

Today, it is a lot easier to publish a rule and have that rule take effect and be and provide the force and effect of law than it is for Congress to actually pass a law.

So if the President decides that he wants to see, let's say, environmental regulations, let's say, the WRRDA piece, the waters of the United States regulations that give the EPA and the Corps of Engineers the equivalent of legislative authority to regulate all of the waters of the United States through some ambiguous language that they had written into a rule, and it is so bad that it says these waters—the old language back from the nineties was these protected streams, as geographically defined, and waters hydrologically connected to them shall be protected streams.

When I go to them and I ask them: What does "hydrologically connected" mean?

Their answer is: Well, we don't know.

And I said: Well, then take it out of the language.

Well, we can't do that.

How can you know you can't take it out of the language if you don't know what it means?

Well, we know that we can't change or amend the language. That is what we are publishing here, and that is what is open for public comment. So you are either going to have to live with it or oppose it successfully. Which is it going to be?

Well, try opposing a rule successfully. Try convincing the EPA that there is enough public comment and criticism that they ought to change that language when they are not accountable to the people.

The EPA, the Corps of Engineers, any one of the dozens of agencies that are out there, their bureaucrats aren't up for election or reelection like Members of Congress are—only their President. Their President has given them orders, or at least a philosophical guideline that they are following, and so we end up with waters of the United States, now, language that says the navigable waters of the United States and any waters that are a significant nexus to the navigable waters of the United States.

Well, think of that. The ambiguous language of waters hydrologically connected to was litigated down to the point where the courts finally ruled that it doesn't have an effectiveness because it is too ambiguous. And so they cooked up some other ambiguous language to litigate for another couple of decades, this ambiguous language of significant nexus to the navigable waters of the United States—significant nexus.

All right. What is nexus? Well, that is anything that intersects. Well, is it 1 intersection? is it 2? is it 3? is it 10? is it 50? is it 100?

If you could go down to New Orleans and track the Mississippi River up to the headwaters, how many significant nexus do you have that are tributaries that run into the Mississippi? How many of those tributaries can be traced up to creeks and streams and tile lines and wells and water lines that go up to the kitchen sink?

They have defined ambiguous language that allows them to regulate the entire United States of America all of the way to the kitchen sink under requiring a significant nexus with the navigable waters of the United States. And we sit here and take this. And they can write rules like this that have the force and effect of law and put a chilling pall on the economy of the United States of America.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker. And the legislative power that has been asserted—and to a large degree, successfully asserted—by the executive branch of government reaches into the Article I authority of the United States Congress. What are we to do about it here? We are to jealously protect this power. Our Founding Fathers charged us with that.

And how do we jealously protect that power? We have only two things we can

do: impeachment, which nobody wants to do, including me; the second component of that is the power of the purse—the power of the purse that James Madison spoke about and wrote about eloquently, and it is a powerful, powerful tool.

But this Congress has declined to use the tool of the power of the purse, with the exception of what turned into the shutdown of our Federal Government in the first day of October of 2013, because they don't want to face the criticism that might come from the public of the American people.

□ 1945

There is a tremendous amount of authority that needs to be clawed back to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous amount of constitutional authority that needs to be clawed back. When I see a CR being prepared that looks like it is going to reflect some of the continuing resolution from last year, I see a continuing resolution that may be coming to expand, for example, immigration standards within the United States of America under the guise of, well, we are just going the kick the can down the road and do some spending that is going to get us into December 9 or on into, hopefully, February 28 or maybe a little later, and some want to go out to September 30.

I think that is too far. I don't think we ought to give a blank check to the next President of the United States if we don't know who that is going to be—even if we know who that is going to be. We ought to be, instead, establishing a scenario by which the new Congress—House and Senate—can pass appropriations bills to get to the end of this fiscal year and get a signature of the next President of the United States, not this one.

By the way, I don't want to give this President of the United States a blank check on anything anymore, but Barack Obama said 22 times—not just 22 times in the interviews, 22 times overheard, or 22 times reported—he said 22 times on videotape that he did not have the legislative authority to grant executive amnesty to illegal aliens in the United States of America—22 times.

The most recent time that he did that was just about 10 days before he changed his mind. He was here in Washington, D.C., giving a speech to a high school here in Washington, D.C. He said to them: You are smart students, and I know that you have been studying your Constitution. You will know this, that I don't have the authority to grant executive—he didn't use the words—but executive amnesty. I am the President of the United States. Congress writes the laws. My job as President is to enforce the laws, and the job of the judiciary is to interpret the laws.

I don't think that you could put it more concisely than that in a matter of two or three sentences. I think the President did a good job of describing

that to the students there. But within about 10 days, he decided that he would reverse all of that, and all of a sudden he had the power to grant an executive amnesty—an unconstitutional executive amnesty, Mr. Speaker.

President Obama unconstitutionally granted an executive amnesty to people who at least assert that they have come into the United States under the age of 18. Apparently, if you are under 18, you are not responsible for your actions, even though that is not true among the States, even in the case of homicide. So the excuse that it was somebody else's fault, it was their parents' fault or somebody else's fault, never held up. It didn't hold up in law.

We write the law here in Congress, but the President granted an executive amnesty. He called it DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. You are a child, apparently, up until the moment that you turn 18, and we will take your word for it even if you are 35 today or older, by the way. That was DACA.

Then there was DAPA, the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans, he called it. That was another unconstitutional reach. Now, these things have—at least the one has been effectively enjoined by Judge Hanen in the Texas District. Now the President has been blocked, I think, effectively until the end of his term on continuing this amnesty process of executive amnesty. Meanwhile, the DACA executive amnesty continues. We have seen evidence that there has been circumvention of the court's order with regard to the DAPA amnesty piece.

While we are watching this unfold, we are a Congress that has allowed for funding to continue with unconstitutional acts of executive amnesty on the part of the President of the United States. I recall a discussion before the Rules Committee before a previous appropriations bill when I made the assertion, Mr. Speaker, that we all take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Every one of us in here, all 435 of us, and every Senator of the 100 Senators on the other end of the Capitol here through the rotunda all take that same oath that we will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help us God. We should take that oath seriously.

Our Founding Fathers imagined that we would always be electing serious representatives who when they took their oath that they would take that oath with their hand on the Bible, and they would know that they had to answer to their contemporaries, their colleagues, their constituents, the American public, and ultimately to God for that oath.

Now, the Constitution means what it says. It has to be interpreted to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification of the Constitution or the subsequent amendments. Our oath needs to be an oath of fidelity to the text and the under-

standing of that Constitution. If it doesn't mean that then our oath means nothing at all. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, taking an oath that is: I pledge to support and defend the Constitution of the United States whatsoever I might interpret it to mean at any convenient point in the future? No. The oath is not to support and defend the Constitution in any way it might be subverted or perverted by any other authority. No. We are taking an oath to support and defend the Constitution according to the text of its clear meaning and understanding as understood at the time of ratification.

If we don't like what that Constitution means, Mr. Speaker, then we have an opportunity to amend the Constitution. It is simply defined and difficult to do for good reason. Simply defined, it just takes a two-thirds majority in the House and Senate to pass a constitutional amendment out of here. The President has no formal say in the process. Although, he will have an opinion, and then that constitutional amendment goes out to the several States as it was referred to in the Constitution, and there, if three-quarters of the States ratify that constitutional amendment, it becomes a component of the Constitution.

Our Founding Fathers gave us a tool to amend the Constitution because they knew they couldn't see into the crystal ball by the centuries. They wanted it to be difficult because they wanted to protect the rights of minorities against the tyranny of the majority, and they wanted to protect God-given liberty. They had a vision, they were well educated, and they had a sound and faithful foundation within them. They laid out a brilliant document that would only maybe be second to the Declaration itself when it comes to the brilliance of documents that are written, at least by Americans and perhaps by mortals altogether.

We are an exceptional nation. God has given us this liberty. We have an obligation to protect it, an obligation to restore the separation of powers, and an obligation to assert the constitutional authority here and say to a President that overreaches: I'm sorry, we are not going to fund your unconstitutional activities. We are going to stand on the principle itself of the Constitution.

Whether or not we agree with policy, we need to have fidelity to the Constitution. We don't get a pass because the Supreme Court errs in its interpretation of the Constitution. We don't get a pass because the President says that he has a different opinion. We don't get a pass no matter which side of this aisle we are on, on the right or on the left. We have an obligation to God and country and to have fidelity to this Constitution.

So now this expansive immigration policy that has been delivered by the President has set a goal of 10,000 refugees coming out of Syria. At this point, I will concede that he has the executive

authority, as granted by Congress, to bring in refugees in numbers and under consultation with the House and the Senate. I have sat in on some of those consultations in previous years, and, in fact, with Hillary Clinton for that matter, and we have arrived at, I will say, a reasonable approach to the numbers of refugees.

But this President had set a goal that he was going to bring in at least 10,000 refugees out of the Syria and Iraq region. When I look at the numbers that are there and the costs that we have, if we want to provide relief to people, we can provide refugee relief to a dozen people in their home country, and that would be Iraq or Syria in these circumstances, for every one that we bring into America.

When you clean that area out, when you bring people out of that area, you are handing it over to ISIS. That is part of what the President has been doing. He has been bringing people out of there and handing that region, the real estate, over to ISIS. They are glad to get rid of them. They killed thousands of people who didn't agree with them, and there are those that are on the run from ISIS. ISIS has been committing a genocide against Christians and against Yazidis in the Middle East, especially in the Nineveh plains region. I have seen the devastation that is taking place there.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into those regions and gotten as close to the ISIS front lines as possible, and that is just outside their artillery range. I went looking for Christian refugee camps, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't find Christian refugee camps in that part of the world, into the edges of Syria, into northern Iraq, into the Kurdish region, and into Turkey for that matter. The place to find Christians in that part of the world is go to church, and there you will find Christians. I have met with the Chaldean bishop twice in Erbil in the northern part of Iraq.

In my last trip in, I went into the Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Church in Istanbul, and I met with a good number of Christians there. Then I went down into Erbil the following morning. It was a Saturday night mass and then a Sunday morning mass in Erbil, and there I met a good number of other Christians. I sat down with a family that was a refugee family out of the Syrian region and met with the Chaldean bishop there.

Here are some things that I learned from them and others: The Assyrian Christians are under attack. There is a heavy assault of genocide against them. Chaldean Christians, same way, they are subjected to genocidal attack from ISIS. The Yazidis, who are technically not Christians, are under genocidal attack from ISIS, and their home region is the Nineveh plains region. The Nineveh plains region runs along, I will say parallel or next to, Mosul in Iraq in that area.

In my discussions with the Barzanis, who are essentially in charge of the

semiautonomous region of the Kurdish region in northern Iraq and the Erbil area and all across, I pressed them that we need to establish an international safe zone for Christians and for the Yazidis, the native minority, so that they can live there in peace and be protected.

I made that case rather extensively to him. He repeated it back to me probably two or three times greater in detail and in conviction than I had delivered it to him. I said to him: Mr. Barzani, you sound like you have said this before. His answer to me was: I have said it before. That is my public opinion. We will support an international safe zone in the Nineveh plains region. We will support it, we will help defend it, and we are committed to it. That is my public position.

I was awfully glad to hear that. It is a lot better solution for refugees to give them protection in their home region and protect them from the genocidal ISIS people than it is to try to bring them out of the Middle East and bring them into the United States, or other places in the world for that matter. But we do have refugees that are looking for a place to call home around this world.

So I stopped in Geneva a couple of months ago, Mr. Speaker, by the way, with Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee, and met with the number two on the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. In that meeting and in that discussion, I learned a few things. I thought that it was a good meeting. It was a very constructive meeting with a lot of information that poured back and forth.

□ 2000

I have this report that I probably will not put into the RECORD. "Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2015," which flows, of course, into 2016, Mr. Speaker.

I noted a report that we had that showed some—and I am close, but maybe not exactly precise on this top number—1,562 refugees out of the Syrian-Iraq region that had come in in a group into the United States. Of that 1,562, roughly, number, I can give you the exact number of Christians that were included in that: one. Only one.

We have seen other larger groups—several thousand—where there was only a little more than 1 percent Christians that come out of there. Christians in that part of the world, as far as refugees are concerned, grow into a number of 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 percent.

So why is it that this administration can bring in more than 10,000 refugees out of that part of the world—now approaching 12,000, looks like will be the number even greater than that by the end of this fiscal year on the last day of this month, Mr. Speaker—and not have any statistical representation of Christians that are emerging from that part of the world?

I asked our director of USCIS, under oath before the Judiciary Committee:

Do you ask these refugees that you claim that you are vetting, and I don't believe can be effectively vetted, do you ask them what their religion is?

He said: No, we don't ask. How would we have any way of knowing? Even if we asked them, we don't know. So that is not a statistic that we collect or keep.

Well, it seems to me to be foolish and imprudent not to be taking a look at the religion of people. We would want to be accelerating bringing Christians into America if we are going to bring refugees at all into America. They are the ones that are targeted. They are the ones that are subjected to genocide.

I would like to carve out that international safe zone and let them live in peace in the area that is their home of antiquity. If that is not going to be the case, why would we be then seeing a misrepresentative sample coming into America, unless there is a preference of, let's say, a bias against Christians coming into America, one out of 1,562, roughly 1 percent out of 3,600 or so?

Then on top of that, when I began to ask the representative of UNHCR, the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees, in Geneva—who gave a very impressive presentation, I would add, Mr. Speaker—when I began to ask those questions: How many refugees do you have cleared to come out of the Middle East that could be going to any of the designated countries that are accepting them? And we know that Germany, Austria, Sweden, and France, to a degree, are picking up refugees. We watched them pour in. I walked with them pouring in that epic migration. Many of them are not cleared, but of those that have been cleared by the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees, how many do you have?

Her answer was: Well, we have 115,000 who have been cleared under a refugee status that have, roughly, a background check—she didn't use the word "roughly"—but a background check done on them that we say are ready to be transported to host countries—115,000.

I said: Do you keep track of what religion they are?

Well, absolutely, yes, we do.

How many Christians?

Fifteen thousand Christians out of 115,000 refugees.

I didn't do the math, but I am going to say that is 12 or 13 percent. Now, if 12 or 13 percent of the refugees that are approved by the United Nations are Christians and 1 percent, or maybe even one out of 1,562, are Christians coming into America, does that mean that this administration set up a filter to filter them out and only made mistakes?

I would support, instead, an effort that if we are going to accept refugees from that part of the world, let's make sure it is the refugees that are subjected to a religious genocide. By the way, I think they are more likely to be assimilated into America judging by

the responses that I have heard from them.

I looked at some of the results in this report that I have referenced, Mr. Speaker, and I was surprised, not quite shocked, to see the number of refugees per 1,000 inhabitants in these countries who have been flooded with refugees. I want to tip my hat to the countries that have taken on a high number of refugees that is also a high percentage of their overall population.

Lebanon is at the top. Out of every 1,000 inhabitants of Lebanon, 183 are refugees. They have been stretched to the seams in Lebanon. Jordan, 87 out of 1,000. And then you go to Turkey, 32; Chad, 26; Djibouti, 22; on down the line getting down to the end, Malta, 17 per thousand. That is a high number, especially for a small island, but it is still a per capita basis. Out of all of the countries in Europe, or the United States for that matter, Sweden, 17 per thousand. That is the highest rate out of Europe in its entirety, or the Western Hemisphere for that matter, or Oceania for that matter. The Swedes continue to take a lot of refugees in.

We have a national destiny, a national security, to be concerned about. We know that it is a very difficult task to vet refugees. I am supportive of an effort to suspend refugees coming out of that part of the world that produces terrorists until such time as we can get a handle on the vetting of them, on the background checks. Many times when they leave their home country and when they enter a foreign country, they will destroy any identifying documents that they might have so that they can't be sent back to their home country.

This is a big problem for Europe. We have watched as the attacks have emerged in country after country. And it is a big problem for the United States. We are challenged with this vetting process that cannot possibly uncover those who will turn to violence. We can look at polling that shows what percentage of people from terrorist-producing countries that settle in the United States are supportive of Sharia law, are supportive of violence to promote Sharia law, that are, at least philosophically, supportive of organizations including and like ISIS.

Those numbers are shocking. They are far too high, which caused our Director of the FBI, James Comey, to make the remark when asked to be responsible for the vetting of the refugees: You are asking us to identify the needles in the haystack. That is a very difficult task to identify the needles in the haystack. But if we could get that done, the far more difficult task is to identify the hay that will become needles.

We have seen that pop up second generation, I will say, immigrants from that part of the world that adhere to the philosophy that believes that they can impose Sharia law on America through violence. And even James Comey has said: You are asking us to

sort out the hay that would become needles later on. That is the second generation terrorists that have attacked us.

So it is a difficult task in a war, Mr. Speaker, that has gone on for 1,400 years. We don't recognize it as a war that has gone on for 1,400 years, but they do.

Then I see legislation that is coming at us in the form of, first, H-2B legislation in a continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker—H-2B legislation. That is low-skilled workers. The highest unemployment rates we have in America are the lowest skilled workers that we have. Double-digit unemployment in the lowest skilled workers that we have in this country. The last thing we need in America are more people that have less skills, but that is what is pouring across our borders in legal and illegal immigration.

We are essentially a welfare state. We have 94.6 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce, and there are another—not quite 9 million—that are on unemployment. So we are 103 million or 104 million Americans of working age who are not in the workforce. Yet, we are watching the entitlements grow and grow and grow and swallow up our budget. So Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—all of them—are on autopilot for spending.

What do we do when we are trying to keep up with the spending from those three?

We go borrow the money from the Chinese or borrow the money from the Saudis. By the way, half the money that we are borrowing that is this \$19.4 trillion in national debt, half of that is borrowed from the American people who have bought the bonds and decided they are going to invest in America's future as if somehow this was an all-out effort like World War II was. Well, it may be because we are under historically low interest rates. If interest rates should double or triple—and they could easily do that, and they would not be in historic places if they did that—we would watch a collapse on our cash flow and a collapse in our budget.

Yet, this Nation has got its borders open and this Nation is bringing in more and more legal immigrants and this Nation is not protecting its borders from illegal immigration. They have turned the border patrol into the welcome wagon. And now we are poised here wondering: Is our leadership going to want to serve up an expansion of H-2Bs as they did a year ago in the C.R. that came down?

I oppose that, Mr. Speaker. We can't be expanding legal immigration. We don't know who the next President is going to be, but if it is Donald Trump, he is not going to be for this.

So is this an effort to try to hustle something through that Barack Obama will sign that the next President may not?

That is H-2Bs.

H-1Bs, for example, are being abused and they are being abused grossly. We

are seeing examples of sometimes hundreds of employees who are being laid off that are charged with the responsibility of training their foreign immigrant replacement that is coming in on an H-1B because the employer can hire cheap labor out of places like India and bring them into the United States and lay off more Americans after those Americans train their incoming workers that will work for a cheaper rate. This is the kind of country that we are building. So we end up with more and more people in that 103 million to 104 million people who are of working age who are simply not in the workforce while all of that is going on. We are requiring companies like maybe Disney, for example, to those employees on their way out of the door: We are laying you off, but, first, do you want to train your employee, your replacement that is coming in on an H-1B?

The H-1B program is abused. The H-2B is bringing in more of a surplus of what we already have, a surplus of unskilled workers. The H-1B program is being used and it is laying off American workers and green card holders that are sitting there now doing jobs that Americans will do. By the way, there isn't any job Americans won't do. They are doing jobs by definition that Americans will do, being required to train their replacements. I think that is wrong. I think it is a crime for a company to require an employee to train their replacement worker while their worker is being replaced by a visa program that is designed to bring in high school people to establish a need that presumably exists within our economy.

How could there be any need for employees in our economy when you have over 100 million people that are of working age and simply not in the workforce?

And then we get to the EB-5 program, Mr. Speaker, the EB-5 program, the investors visa, that was set up a quarter of century or so ago and said that if you have \$1 million and you can create 10 jobs investing and establishing an enterprise in America, we will give you a pass coming into the United States. A quarter of a century ago, \$1 million was real money. Today it is still real money to a lot of people in America, but not so much as it was then. If you are going into a stressed area, an economically disadvantaged area, you can get by with half a million dollars.

I am seeing programs like here comes—let me see—here comes 30—no, say 29—29 Chinese each with half a million dollars that bundle that money all together and maybe team up with one American. Now they have a business enterprise. Now we have 29 new Americans—Chinese—it will be the rich Chinese that are buying a path to citizenship here. Once they do that, then they can begin that family reunification plan and begin bringing their family back into the United States, too.

I am seeing enterprises where an investment in, let's say, a commercial

building takes a pool of—it is a \$30 million investment and it takes a pool of 60 Chinese with half a million dollars each to build this commercial building, they then become conceivably partners in that, and they have a path into the United States. We are selling citizenship. There is a price on it.

And on top of that, we have birth tourism, Mr. Speaker, birth tourism that these numbers will be a little old, 3, 4, or 5 years old where—and I am focusing on the Chinese at this point—a turnkey operation. If you have \$30,000 and you are a pregnant Chinese woman, you can fly to, conceivably, California, most likely, and be put up there in housing and have your baby. Your baby gets a birth certificate. You can fly back to China. And when that baby becomes 18, then can begin the family reunification program and the extended family and all can be hauled into America—a \$30,000 turnkey. But you have to wait for 18 years before that baby is old enough.

□ 2015

If you can't wait, don't want to wait, and you have got the money, you can lay \$500,000 down on the barrelhead, cash on the barrelhead, and get a path into America, a green card and citizenship.

These programs are just wrong. The EB-5 program should be ended; it should be sunset.

If we have to make concessions on H-2B, we don't need to make them. We should not make immigration decisions in a CR. We ought not make them in a treaty. We ought not make them in a CR, and we ought not make them in a lameduck. Immigration decisions should be made subject to the pen, the signature of the next President of the United States. They need to have the considered judgment of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, Mr. Speaker. I will push that we do only the minimum in a lameduck, if we have to do anything at all.

I would promote that a continuing resolution could kick us into the early part of next year, when we have a new Congress seated, when we have a new President that is inaugurated and sworn into office, and that the will of the American people can be reflected in the large initiatives that would be advanced by the House of Representatives, by the United States Senate, and by the next President that should reflect the will of the people.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is our charge and our responsibility because we have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. It is our duty, and we owe the people in this country our best effort and our best judgment. Our best effort and our best judgment includes: we listen to them; we gather all the information that we can; we look into the crystal ball of the future as far as we can; and, with good and clear conscience and good judgment, we make those decisions that reflect their

will that is within the confines of the Constitution, that fit within free enterprise, then lay down a foundation for America's destiny so that we can be ever-stronger in the future and so that we can have an ascending destiny rather than a descending destiny.

With all of that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your attention. I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3590, HALT TAX INCREASES ON THE MIDDLE CLASS AND SENIORS ACT

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-741) on the resolution (H. Res. 858) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3590) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the income threshold used in determining the deduction for medical care, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5620, VA ACCOUNTABILITY FIRST AND APPEALS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-742) on the resolution (H. Res. 859) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5620) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today once again to help coanchor, along with my distinguished colleague Representative JOYCE BEATTY, this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour where, for the next 60 minutes, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the

American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, to the House of Representatives, to the districts that we represent collectively, as well as to the United States of America.

It is a very special week for us, and we are going to spend some time during the next 60 minutes discussing the trajectory of the Congressional Black Caucus, which has been serving in this body for the better part of the last 45 years.

The Congressional Black Caucus was formally established on March 30, 1971, by 13 pioneering Members who had a vision of making sure that, within this great Article I institution, there was a body that could speak directly to the hopes, the dreams, the needs, and the aspirations of the African American people and all those underrepresented communities throughout America. We are going to talk a bit about that journey, about the accomplishments, and about the challenges that still remain.

I want to yield now to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), one of the very distinguished members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who happens to be the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and has ably represented the 30th Congressional District in Texas, anchored in Dallas, for almost 25 years. It has been an honor and a privilege for me and for others to work with her, to learn from her, and to be mentored by her.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate the leaders of the Special Order tonight, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY and Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to recognize the contributions of the CBC and its members after 45 years of service to the United States Congress and our Nation and, really, the world.

The CBC was founded March 30, 1971, with the chief objective of bringing awareness to the issues facing Black America and addressing the concerns of longstanding inequality in opportunity for African Americans.

We have an original member who is retiring this year, the Honorable CHARLES B. RANGEL. The most senior Member in this House is one of the original members, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS.

Today, the Congressional Black Caucus has grown to become a fundamental institution within Congress. From voting rights and gun violence to poverty in America and justice reform, the CBC engages on multiple fronts to address the plethora of issues facing our Nation and the world.

To date, we have had a string of able leaders chair the CBC, and I am proud to have been one of them from 2001 to 2003. Currently, as co-chair of the CBC Technology and Infrastructure Investment Task Force and a member of numerous other CBC task forces, I am

proud of the progress that we have been able to achieve through our coordination and cooperation with the Members of the Congress, stakeholders, and the community. History has proven that the importance of the CBC endures even today as we face new challenges to voting rights and experience new strife within our communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus serves as a key voice in Congress for people of color and vulnerable communities. Together, the CBC and its allies have paved the way for new progress as we face the challenges of the 21st century. Our promise that was first made in 1971 to give the voiceless a voice is continually fulfilled through the CBC's work, and I look forward to keeping up with our fight to preserve liberty and equal justice for all. We have come from promise to progress.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from the great Lone Star State for her eloquent words and observations and, of course, for her leadership not just in the Congress, but for her past leadership as a distinguished former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

It is now my honor and my privilege to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), my classmate, who is one of the most distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. She had an incredible career before she arrived here in the Congress as a leader in the Ohio Legislature, as a successful small-business woman, as a university administrator at The Ohio State University, and in so many other ways, and then, of course, has taken the House of Representatives by storm since her arrival as part of the class of 2012.

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, to my colleague, I am so honored to be here tonight speaking in this Chamber and to the American people about the Congressional Black Caucus: 45 years of leadership, from promise to progress.

You have heard my distinguished colleague and coanchor of our Special Order hour, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, tell and share with us the history of our beginning of the Congressional Black Caucus back on March 30, 1971. We have heard the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas share with us about our members who had the foresight and the vision. What she didn't tell you was that she was the first African American nurse to be elected and to serve in this Congress.

Somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, I am sure in our rich history someone made the promise that, in the future, we would have a Shirley Chisholm, the promise that some little girl would be able to come to this Congress and serve, and that became a reality with Shirley Chisholm. I am sure some mother said the promise should be that a woman should lead us as a nurse, and then came Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus has been committed to advancing equity and access and equal protection under the law for Black Americans. And while we were established March 30, 1971, it was on that day that a Congressman by the name of Charles C. Diggs, Jr., a Democrat from the great State of Michigan, presented the statement to the President of the United States, which included more than 60 recommendations for executive action on issues for Black America and set the foundation for the promise and the progress of African Americans.

We heard my distinguished colleague talk about the hopes and the needs and the dreams. Those were the promises. And that is why it is so important for us to come today and talk about the progress that we have made.

Even though you will hear us say 1971, when the Congressional Black Caucus was established, we can trace our legislative history back further through the civil rights efforts of the 1960s, which included such landmark victories as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which we still champion today. Those legislative policy victories of the past demonstrate that when people speak with a singular, powerful voice, Mr. Speaker, we can have a government that works for us; we can fulfill our country's pledge and promise of liberty and justice for all.

It was through that statement that the Congressional Black Caucus began its history of advocacy on behalf of the African American community. Since then, for the last 45 years, the Congressional Black Caucus has been the voice for people of color and at-risk communities in our different districts. We have been and remain committed to utilizing the full constitutional power, statutory authority, and financial resources of the government to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to achieve the promise of the American Dream, Mr. Speaker.

From promise to progress gave us the first African American to hold the distinction of dean of this House, the most senior Member of Congress; and the first African American to swear in the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives was Congressional Black Caucus member Congressman JOHN CONYERS.

From promise to progress has given us a motivating book, "Blessed Experiences: Genuinely Southern, Proudly Black," a story of inspirational words on how an African American boy from the Jim Crow-era South was able to beat the odds, Mr. Speaker, to achieve great success and become, as President Barack Obama describes him, "One of a handful of people who, when they speak, the entire Congress listens," assistant Democratic leader and the third highest ranking Democrat in the House of Representatives, Congressman JAMES E. CLYBURN.

The 21st president, national president of the largest African American female

sorority serves here with us, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE from the 11th Congressional District of my State.

□ 2030

From promise to progress, Mr. Speaker, has given us the first Black woman elected to Congress from Alabama and the only Democrat in Alabama's seven-member congressional delegation. That is Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL. Her first piece of successful legislation recognized the four little girls who tragically lost their lives during the bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you can see why it is important for us to be here and to talk about the many promises and, more significantly and of greater importance, the progress that we have made. We are one of the largest Member organizations in the United States House of Representatives, making up 23 percent of the House Democratic Caucus and 10 percent of the entire United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of where the Congressional Black Caucus is today, I think of the shoulders that we stand on. Fifty-one years later, I think of Bloody Sunday where on March 7, 1965, some 600 peaceful participants in a voting rights march from Selma, Alabama, to the State capital in Montgomery were violently attacked by Alabama State Troopers with nightsticks, tear gas, whips, and dogs, as they attempted to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge. These brave men and women, Mr. Speaker, were led by civil rights champion, Congressman JOHN LEWIS from the Fifth District of Georgia. What a great example of promise to progress.

Last year, I had the distinct honor of joining nearly 300,000 others, including 90 bipartisan lawmakers, distinguished guests, civil rights activists, and former Presidents of these United States as we marched, commemorating the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday over that Edmund Pettus Bridge, marching ourselves from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, from promises to progress.

Let me say or remind you again—and I want America to know—there were 90 bipartisan Members. That means Democrats and Republicans. I could say bicameral—Democrat and Republican Senators and Members of this great body that we serve in. Certainly, as we marched and they joined us, they were making a commitment to the progress from those promises that were made 50-some years ago.

We come here tonight, my colleague and I, representing the Congressional Black Caucus because we want you, Mr. Speaker, and America to know that when we reflect on our history, it is our culture, it is our passion, and it is our reason and resolve for standing here and standing up for the issues and the legislation that we believe in, that we write and we support. We think it is

important for you to have a better understanding why so often we come here and ask that we join together.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of our history, I reflect on names like Frederick Douglass, a historic social reformer and statesman; Shirley Chisholm, as I mentioned earlier, the first African American woman elected to the United States Congress; and, yes, Rosa Parks, the mother of the modern civil rights movement.

You see, Rosa Parks embodied courage, and she inspired me as a mentor when she refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery, Alabama, bus to a White passenger on December 1, 1955. Some would say she was tired, but I say to you that she was tired not from her day's work as a seamstress, but she was tired from the injustices. I have followed her whole career and was so inspired by her that I wrote the first legislation when I served in the Ohio House of Representatives in this country to honor her on that December 1. Every day since then, I go back to the district and we honor her. You see, she sat down against the odds for something she believed in. I have carried that with me over the years, realizing that there could be a day, but never dreaming that it would be here in this Congress that I, too, would be willing to sit down for something that I believed in.

Mr. Speaker, there have been so many issues that I have done that because I want us to have the progress from the promises that I make to my district. The progress, whether it is gun safety, whether it is the progress of making sure that every child has enough food when they go to bed, whether it is making sure that there is an affordable college education for every child that is able to go, whether it is making sure that there is equal pay for equal work, those are just a few of the things that I wanted to make sure that we talked about.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important for us to tell our story, our history, and our culture. Hopefully, tonight is more than us just talking. Hopefully, tonight will help Members and the public understand our history and our passion.

This week, lastly, let me say how honored I am to be in Washington, D.C., when more than 10,000 people will come to our Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Annual Legislative Conference where we will talk about the issues and we will educate emerging leaders and civil rights leaders, not just all individuals of color. There will be individuals of all backgrounds, races, and ethnicities that will join us in our commitment to fulfill those promises on the progress that we would like to have.

We will open the National African American Museum. What an honor it will be to see the great achievements and contributions for those who have so courageously pushed the boundaries and moved our country forward in the name of justice and equality.

When I think about moving forward, I cannot help but reflect on the 44th President of these United States. Like many of us—and, Mr. Speaker, maybe even like you—he worked his way through school with the help of scholarship money and a student loan. Yet, maybe it was the progress and the promise of progress that a Martin Luther King, Jr., wanted when he said that he hoped his four children would not be judged by the color of their skin, but the content of their character. Maybe that is why a young Barack Obama pushed forward, went back to his community, and worked and gave service, which is the word that he likes to use so much. It was the service back to the movement and to his community in Chicago; that gave us the progress of having our first African American President, a scholar, someone who has had many firsts.

So I say to you that it is indeed my honor that I can stand here on this floor with my colleague as we move forward, the progress as we move forward on the promises of our colleagues.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio for laying out both the history of the Congressional Black Caucus as well as documenting what current membership continues to do and breaks new ground here in the House of Representatives on behalf of the people that they are charged to represent in this august body, as well as on behalf of the great Nation that we are all privileged to serve.

As Representative BEATTY mentioned, there were 13 individuals who had the vision and the foresight to found the Congressional Black Caucus back in March of 1971. The actual founding took place at a meeting between those 13 Members and President Richard Nixon, where the President was presented, by the newly formed Congressional Black Caucus, a statement of requests, goals, objectives, and demands related to the plight of African Americans here in these United States of America. The Congressional Black Caucus was founded on the premise that it was necessary to speak truth to power, given the unique plight of African Americans in this country.

As was mentioned by Representative BEATTY, there are two founding members who still serve in the House of Representatives; Representative JOHN CONYERS from Detroit, Michigan, and, of course, CHARLIE RANGEL, the Lion of Lenox Avenue, the first African American ever to chair the Ways and Means Committee in this institution, a prolific legislator here in the House who has announced earlier this year his intention to retire.

I am proud to serve a district that was once represented in part by the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman ever elected to the House of Representatives in a district in Brooklyn in 1968. She came here indicating that she was unbought and unbossed, and that tradition has

been continued by people like MAXINE WATERS, MARCIA FUDGE, JOYCE BEATTY, and so many others who represent their district with passion and with integrity.

The question has been asked: Why is there a need for a Congressional Black Caucus? We have come a long way in America. We have made a lot of progress. The 44th President of the United States of America happens to be African American. Why is there a need for a Congressional Black Caucus?

That question was asked in 1971, of course. I think it takes an understanding of the unique journey of African Americans in this country to understand why the Congressional Black Caucus was first founded in 1971 and why it still remains relevant today.

This country was founded, of course, on high-minded principles of liberty and justice for all and the notion that all men are created equally and were endowed with certain inalienable rights by the great democratic republic that was birthed by the Founding Fathers of this Nation.

As many have observed, notwithstanding the tremendous nature of the principles embedded in the birth of this country, there was also a genetic defect on the question of race. That genetic defect first took the form, of course, of chattel slavery, which was one of the worst crimes ever perpetrated against humanity, resulting in the loss of tens of millions of individuals killed during the middle passage and the systemic oppression of African Americans, the kidnap, the rape, the enslavement here in the United States of America. This happened at the same time when the country was founded on these great, high-minded principles.

Of course, the question of slavery was finally resolved with the victory of the North in 1865. The North, of course, was fighting the South in the Confederacy. The Confederacy has been put to rest, although some people still want to uplift the Confederate battle flag. That is an issue for another day.

Slavery was put to rest. Then in an effort to correct the defect in our democracy, the 13th Amendment ending and outlawing chattel slavery was passed and added to the Constitution; the 14th Amendment, equal protection under the law; and the 15th Amendment related to the right to vote for African Americans. The so-called reconstruction amendments took place.

□ 2045

But then, thereafter, something interesting happened. We were on the pathway to fulfilling the great promise of a colorblind society in America, but then the North pulled out of the South, the Reconstruction era ended, and it was replaced systematically with a system of Jim Crow, enforced segregation of the races, and the suppression of African Americans largely in the Deep South, notwithstanding the high-minded principles that were just embedded

in the United States Constitution related to the 14th Amendment and the Equal Protection Clause and the 15th Amendment and the right to vote. Those were just words on a piece of paper, as far as many people were concerned in the Deep South who were perpetuating Jim Crow segregation.

That Jim Crow segregation, of course, was accompanied by a lynching epidemic that claimed the lives of thousands of individuals, race riots directed at successful African Americans and African American communities, and so many other things that were documented in this country.

Why is there a need for a Congressional Black Caucus? The country was founded under these great high-minded principles, but, at the same time on this journey, we have gone from slavery, a brief period of Reconstruction, into the Jim Crow era.

As Representative JOYCE BEATTY so eloquently documented, in terms of the legislative efforts of African American Members who were here in partnership with people of goodwill of all races, Democrats and Republicans, we passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act here in this Congress endeavoring to end Jim Crow segregation, passed the 1965 Voting Rights Act here in this Congress to try to bring to life the 15th Amendment, largely ignored in many parts of this country, and then of course in 1968 passed the Fair Housing Act.

Then an interesting thing happened. You have a President who is elected in the aftermath of the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., the Senator from New York, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the great civil rights leader on what he terms a Southern strategy of trying to capitalize on White backlash against the progress that has been made by African Americans.

I am trying to figure out what was the nature of the backlash? The progress that was made was a Civil Rights Act to try to deal with the Jim Crow segregation that some people put into place in the aftermath of the end of slavery, and the 1965 Voting Rights Act that was put into place in order to try to bring to life the fact that there were people intentionally ignoring the 15th Amendment to the United States Constitution. Why is there a need for a Congressional Black Caucus?

So we moved from slavery into Jim Crow, and that is all dealt with for a brief period in the 1960s in terms of the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, but then we enter into this interesting period where Richard Nixon is elected on a strategy that played to the racial fears and anxieties of some in America. I don't want to get in trouble by putting a percentage onto it, but played into the anxieties and fears of some in America. History often repeats itself.

And so the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971 made the decision that they were going to place a list of demands on the table for Richard Nixon to deal with, given this history. Little did they

know—or perhaps they suspected—that in that same year what I would call the third defect that America has had to grapple with in terms of the African American community as compared to its high-minded aspirations was about to be visited on communities of color, and that was mass incarceration.

It was in that year in 1971 where Richard Nixon declared a war on drugs by stating that drug abuse was public enemy number one. At the time in America, there were less than 350,000 people incarcerated in this country. Today, there are more than 2.1 million, the overwhelming majority of whom are Black and Latino. We know that African Americans are consistently incarcerated at levels much higher than others in the United States, notwithstanding a similar level of criminality as it relates to the crime that was committed, the activity that was engaged in, and the conduct that was prosecuted. The disparities are objectively clear.

Mass incarceration has been devastating for African American communities all across this country, and it is shameful that America incarcerates more people here in the United States than any other country in the world. We incarcerate more people than Russia and China combined. This overcriminalization is something that I am hopeful we can deal with in this Congress before this President leaves and then continue to work with the next President of the United States of America.

So people ask the question: Why do we need a Congressional Black Caucus? We have gone from slavery, a brief interruption with the Reconstruction Amendments into Jim Crow for another 100 years, 14th Amendment and 15th Amendment are ignored in large parts of the country, and then we get an interruption. Some progress was made with the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and the 1968 Fair Housing Act. Then we get Richard Nixon. And the Congressional Black Caucus is founded at the same time.

For the last 45 years, we have been dealing with mass incarceration. But notwithstanding the intensity of the systematic issues put upon the African American community, we have seen tremendous progress during that same period of time because of Members like William Clay, Sr., a founder from St. Louis, or Louis Stokes from Cleveland, Ohio, and Augustus Hawkins from Los Angeles, people who understood that when Abraham Lincoln asked the question, how do we create a more perfect Union, and he asked that question in the context of the Civil War that was raging at the time, that America is a constant work in progress. And year after year, decade after decade, century after century, we can improve upon who we are, but there is still a lot more that needs to be done.

Thankfully, we have seen increases in educational attainment, increases in

employment over the last 8 years in the African American community since the height of the Great Recession, and we have seen a return of some of the homeownership that was lost during the recession, but there are still a lot of things that need to be done. And so a Congressional Black Caucus which has grown from the 13 original founding members to 46 members today, 45 in the House of Representatives, 1 of whom is a Republican, and a 46th member who serves in the United States Senate.

We stand on the shoulders of these founding members, proud of what has been accomplished like the effort led by Ron Dellums which resulted in legislation to push back against the racist apartheid regime in 1986, a bill that was vetoed by Ronald Reagan, and then overridden by Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate, the first foreign policy bill overridden in the Congress passed by Ron Dellums that led the effort related to South African apartheid.

So many issues have been championed by the founding members. JOHN CONYERS held a series of hearings on the issue of police brutality. It is ironic that right now, along with Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, they are leading a bipartisan task force on police community relations to deal with what I view, at least, as an epidemic of police violence directed at unarmed African American men across this country, but JOHN CONYERS was involved in that effort in the early 1970s.

And so there is a lot of things that we have been able to work on during this 45-year journey. Tremendous progress has been made, despite the efforts to paint the community as overrun by some out there in this country as a thriving Black middle class. A successful group of entrepreneurs, professionals, lawyers, doctors, engineers, scientists, and so many others have shown what can be done based on their promise and their potential despite the obstacles that exist as we move toward a more colorblind society. But we, of course, are not there yet.

That is why we are of the view that, despite the fact that we have made tremendous progress in America, we still have a way to go. There is still a need, an urgent need for a Congressional Black Caucus, which has often stood up not just on behalf of African Americans but has stood up on behalf of those who are the least, the lost, and the left-behind in the United States of America, regardless of color.

That is why the Congressional Black Caucus has been known over these four decades as the conscience of the Congress, and it has been an honor and a privilege for me, during my two terms, to serve in this august body.

I want to yield for a moment to my colleague, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, and perhaps ask the question: What are some of the issues that you think are pressing as it relates to the Congressional Black Caucus moving

forward, and what do you say to critics who make the argument, why is there a need for African Americans in the Congress to get together at this point on behalf of the communities we were elected to represent? Is there still a need for a Congressional Black Caucus in 2016?

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say thank you to Congressman JEFFRIES for that question. If I think of one of my favorite quotes by Shirley Chisholm, Mr. Speaker, she said: "You don't make progress by standing on the sidelines . . . you make progress by implementing ideas."

That is what the Congressional Black Caucus does. We don't just come here on the floor and talk about our rich history. We meet, and we strategize, and we go back home to our districts, and we come back, and we write legislation, so there is definitely a need. And I think it will be witnessed all across this country this week when the thousands of thousands of individuals come here because they will have an opportunity to see Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL or Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS or Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY because of the issues and what they stand for, and that is why there is a need.

When I think of our commitment and conviction, Mr. Speaker, I remember when Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY said: I won't stand up for moments of silence again until we do something about the shootings and the deaths. She had the courage to walk up to the well and say: I am not being disrespectful, but I want us to really stand for something.

So, yes, I want us to have gun safety. I want us to have legislation because we have bipartisan legislation. I want us to bring that to the floor, so I can say in my district, I am standing up for families, I am standing up for safety.

□ 2100

You mentioned prison reform. I want us to look at how we can come together as Democrats and Republicans, Mr. Speaker, and pass some bipartisan legislation.

When I think of the Congressional Black Caucus and what we represent, when you add it all up together, we cover some 21 States, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands, and we represent some 31 million people. Over half of our Congressional Black Caucus membership are lawyers, people who have studied the laws and understand the procedures and the rules and the regulations.

So, yes, there is a need for us to continue the journey. There is a need for us to listen to one another. You see, Mr. Speaker, we don't come here tonight to just talk about us as 46 members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We come here to leave you with a message and to speak to America to say: Just think of what we could do if we worked together. Just think about when you go back home to your dis-

trict and you say you want us to be safe and you want us to have equal and fair rights; you talk about wanting your children and families to be healthy and educated.

So, you see, we have the same message, it seems, until we come to the floor. That is why we come here tonight with strong messages—because we want to make sure that you understand that we believe that we could work together.

This week—again, I will say it repeatedly, because it is so important to us—we will have brain trust sessions, Mr. JEFFRIES, that will talk about how long we have been in this fight for progress for health care, how long we have been in this fight for criminal justice. We will also have workshops like financial literacy and financial services. If we don't come together to educate our communities and our people, if we don't come together to share with you, I believe that we won't be able to understand one another.

So the answer is yes and yes: yes, there is a lot of work to continue to be done; and yes, we need to continue to have a Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I mentioned during my remarks that we have been on this journey of the 15th Amendment to the United States Constitution to try to guarantee the right to vote, regardless of race, coming out of the oppression of chattel slavery. And then we moved, Representative BEATTY, from the 15th Amendment to this Jim Crow period and the 1965 Voting Rights Act to try to bring to life what is a fundamental tenet of American democracy, which is the ability of the people to represent those who will represent them in government—government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

But yet, as a result of a recent Supreme Court decision, *Shelby County v. Holder*, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, section 4 and section 5, the preclearance provisions, have been eviscerated because of, in my view, an inappropriate reading of that statute relative to the United States Constitution.

So the Congressional Black Caucus continues to fight to uplift for all Americans the ability to participate in our democracy. The shame is that voting in this country seems to have become a partisan issue, notwithstanding the fact that the Voting Rights Act has a great bipartisan tradition. It was passed with the support of Democrats and Republicans because, of course, we know at the time there were Dixiecrats in this Congress—Democrats, by registration, in the Deep South who fought hard against voting rights. So it took Republicans on the other side of the aisle in both the House and the Senate in order to get the legislation passed.

It is interesting to me that, every year, the Voting Rights Act was reauthorized. Four times it was signed back into law by a Republican President: in 1970, Richard Nixon; 1975, Gerald Ford; 1982, Ronald Reagan; 2006, George W. Bush.

So when we come to the floor of the House of Representatives or when I sit on the Judiciary Committee or we work with JOHN LEWIS and JOHN CONYERS and TERRI SEWELL and JIM CLYBURN and others to try to move voting rights legislation forward, we are just saying: return to the great bipartisan tradition of making sure that every single American in this country has an opportunity to participate in the right to vote.

Until that happens, the Congressional Black Caucus has an urgent issue that we need to deal with for the communities that we represent in African American or Latino neighborhoods and for all Americans.

The other thing I will point out and ask my colleague to perhaps react to is that what I found fascinating here in terms of common ground, the opportunity to uplift everyone through the mission and the work of the Congressional Black Caucus, is the fact that when you look at persistently poor counties in America, counties that will be defined as 20 percent or more of the population living below the poverty line for 30 or more years, persistently poor counties, a majority of those counties are represented by Republicans in the House of Representatives and not by Democrats.

So when JIM CLYBURN, for instance, presents things like 10-20-30, a funding formula where 10 percent of any funding allocation will be given to communities where 20 percent or more of that county has been living below the poverty line for 30 or more years, it would actually benefit Republican-represented counties more than it would Democrat-represented counties. This is because the Congressional Black Caucus really is interested in uplifting the plight of all Americans who have been left behind. We are hoping that we can find some bipartisan cooperation in that area as well.

I yield to Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, for mentioning 10-20-30. You are absolutely right that it would benefit Republican districts and their constituents more than many of our constituents. But I think that is because, when we think of poverty, we think of children and families living in poverty, not Democrats, not Republicans. Our mission here, Mr. Speaker, is to make this place a better place through our legislation for everyone. So I think that is just one example.

You mentioned a lot about our history and how far we have come and the roles of other Presidents. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to also share that we come here tonight almost with a proposition to say to you: We want to work with you on those issues that we have highlighted.

So often when we come here, we will hear colleagues say "We can't work together," "We don't work together," or, "Why don't you just come and work with us?" I don't want us to leave tonight without leaving the message that

we have a lot of work that still needs to be done.

I can remember reading back in 1971, Congressman JEFFRIES, when Richard Nixon was giving his first inaugural address, he refused to meet with the members of the Congressional Black Caucus. They stood up for something. They left the floor and did not stay for his address to the Nation. I say that with mixed feelings, but I say that to make the point of how strongly we believe in what we do.

You mentioned the 10-20-30 plan. We had Speaker RYAN come to the Congressional Black Caucus and hear the plan, to get a commitment from him. He represents all of us; and he gave us the nod, as you will remember, on that plan.

So I say tonight, let us reflect on all the things that my colleague and the coanchor of this Special Order hour said, because that is what it is. It is our hour to address you, Mr. Speaker, and the Nation about so many of the issues that we want to make sure that, when we leave here, we are not leaving with just promises, but we are leaving with progress.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you for those very thoughtful observations.

Perhaps I will end by talking for a moment or so about the progress that we have made under a former member of the Congressional Black Caucus who was a Senator from Illinois and here in the Capitol for a few years before he was elected to be the 44th President of the United States of America. We are proud that he came through the CBC on his way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Upon his election, there was the view that perhaps we were entering into a phase of a post-racial society. I think we understand that that was probably irrationally optimistic of those who made that observation because of the long history that we detailed here of what the African American journey has been in America.

But I find it interesting that so many people, to this day, refuse to give this President credit for the progress that has been made under his watch over the last 8 years. There have been more than 75 or so consecutive months of private sector job creation under this President. More than 14 million private sector jobs have been created under this President.

Parenthetically, I make the observation that, under the 8 years of George Bush, the country lost 650,000 jobs. But we are going to talk about a sluggish recovery. We lost 650,000 jobs under supply-side economic policies of George W. Bush. We have gained more than 14 million jobs under progressive policies of Barack Obama.

The deficit has been reduced by over \$500 million. When the President came in, the stock market was at 6,000; now it is over 18,000. Of course, more than 20 million previously uninsured Americans now have health coverage under the Presidency of Barack Obama.

So he came in with a lot of promises, and I am proud that there has been tremendous progress that has been made for the United States of America as a whole, and certainly for African American communities.

As the President himself observed, the problems that we have to confront in America won't be resolved by one President during one term or even during an entire tenure, because we are on this long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union. The hope is that, each time a President steps up and Congress is there to represent the will of the people, working on behalf of our constituents, we can make meaningful progress on dealing with the economic and social justice issues of the day.

Fundamentally, that is what the Congressional Black Caucus is all about. That was the vision that was put forth by those 13 Founders: speaking truth to power, representing the interests of the African American communities they were elected to serve—and everyone else—regardless of race, who is entitled to the fiercest possible representation in this democracy.

□ 2115

So it is with great pride that Representative BEATTY and I stand here today, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, standing on the shoulders of those 13 founding members, under the current leadership of Representative G.K. BUTTERFIELD from North Carolina, representing this continuum of the African American journey, both here in Congress and in this great country; confident that, despite the obstacles that will consistently be erected that, as we have demonstrated over time during 45 years, we will make progress, we will translate promise into action, and we will continue the journey of perfecting a more perfect union in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I believe that the week of our Annual Legislative Conference is an appropriate time to reflect on the progress we have made as a group and the challenges we face in articulating a vision for a more free and fair America.

When 13 of us first gathered in 1969 as a "Democratic Select Committee," we had ambitions of using our collective voices to advance a political agenda for black America in response to expected retrenchment from the incoming Nixon administration. Two years later, on the motion of Rep. Charlie Rangel, we became the Congressional Black Caucus.

In that time, the Caucus has gone from being on Nixon's "original enemies list" to the conscience of the Congress. Our membership has grown from 13 to 46 and our alumnae include numerous cabinet members and a President of the United States.

In looking back 45 years, the Caucus can point to many victories in the areas of voting rights, economic empowerment, education and healthcare. These victories were not just for

black Americans, but all Americans in search of justice and equality before the law.

However, in reflecting on the history of the Caucus, we must be honest about the uneven nature of politics. Many of the challenges we faced in 1971 still burden the African-American community today. Black Americans are still disproportionately poor, under-educated, unemployed and incarcerated. Daily we confront the political challenges of how to ensure that the rising economic tide lifts the boats in our communities.

The more surprising challenge faced by the Caucus is mounted by those who would turn back the clock on some of our hardest won victories: namely those who would suppress our voting rights as a means of defeating a progressive agenda for equality. We beware of those who want to make "America great again," harkening back to a past where Jim Crow and discrimination ruled the day.

This politics of division is one of our main challenges as a Caucus. Our nation once again finds itself at odds over the issue of race relations, most clearly illustrated by the issue of police accountability. A recent ABC poll found that a majority of Americans surveyed believed that race relations are bad and getting worse. With the election of the first African-American President, this is clearly not what we hoped for in this new millennium.

As the former Chairman and now Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have dedicated my career to 3 goals to jobs, justice and peace. After decades of community complaints about police brutality, I chaired hearings in Los Angeles, New York City, and even Dallas which built the record for passage of marquee legislation like the 1994 "Pattern and Practice" statute, which gives the Department of Justice the authority to investigate law enforcement discrimination and abuse in cities like Ferguson and Baltimore.

The loss of lives in Baton Rouge, suburban St. Paul and Dallas, has left the nation in shock, as seemingly every day the media brings us news of violence borne of hate and intolerance. Modern technology and the advent of social media have made us all witnesses, just like the marches in Selma and Birmingham, making it impossible to dismiss them as fiction or some else's problem. We live these injustices first hand.

Vivid images of police abuse galvanized our national resolve to pass civil rights legislation, like the Voting Rights Act, and is putting all politicians on notice that simmering community unrest with the police has reached a turning point. Today, we represent communities that are increasingly unified, unafraid, and unwilling to wait. We have a growing coalition of allies. Some white, some Hispanic, some Asian, and some who serve as police and who want their badges to mean something more. The daily reminders of injustice have forced us to measure the distance between Dr. King's Dream and our own reality—but they also give us the resolve to close it for good.

Last year, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing on 21st Century Policing Strategies to begin addressing these issues at the Federal level. I also re-introduced both the End Racial Profiling Act and the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act around the same time. The Republican Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I are currently negotiating a version of the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act and during the August recess, we joined together to form a bipartisan Congressional

working group—including three Caucus members—with a focus on finding common ground between police and the communities they are sworn to protect and serve.

The profound support for criminal justice reform I have seen from Members of the CBC and all sides of the political spectrum from across our country is something we need to build upon. It's not the only solution, but one of them.

As a Caucus, our work is far from done. We can't bring back Alton Sterling, Philando Castile, Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, or the hundreds of black men and women who've lost their lives to excessive force. And we can't bring back the officers in Dallas and Baton Rouge or others who've been killed while protecting their communities. But at a time when we face so much that challenges our faith and tries to break our spirit, we must dedicate ourselves in our 45th year to engaging the difficult issues to make lasting change in our communities.

History shows that Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have overcome great challenges. Now we have within us and beside us, an intentionally peaceful and unified community that is now better able to confront today's challenges than ever before.

A STEP BACKWARDS IN RACE RELATIONS AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to appear here on the House floor, especially following colleagues giving an important address.

I was saddened to see what seemed, in fact, to be a huge step backwards in racial relations.

"California State University Debuts Segregated Housing for Black Students."

"California State University Los Angeles recently debuted segregated housing for Black students, a move intended to protect them from 'micro-aggressions,' according to the College Fix.

"Last year, Cal State L.A.'s Black Student Union wrote a letter to the university's president outlining a series of demands, including the 'creation and financial support of a CSLA housing space delegated for Black students and a full time Resident Director who can cater to the needs of Black students.'

"Many Black CSLA students cannot afford to live in Alhambra or the surrounding area with the high prices of rent. A CSLA housing space delegated for Black students would provide a cheaper alternative housing solution for Black students. This space would also serve as a safe space for Black CSLA students to congregate, connect and learn from each other," the letter stated.

Anyway, "Robert Lopez, a spokesman for the university, confirmed to The College Fix that students' demand for housing specifically for Black stu-

dents had been met, saying that the school's new Halisi Scholars Black Living-Learning Community 'focuses on academic excellence and learning experiences that are inclusive and non-discriminatory.'

That seems to be a bit of anathema. But anyway, "Lopez said the Black student housing is within the existing residential complex on campus.

"The College Fix noted that other universities, including the University of California, Davis; the University of California, Berkeley; and University of Connecticut offer similar housing arrangements."

It just seems like we are going backwards with that kind of thing.

I heard my colleagues mention the great dream—part of the great dream of Martin Luther King, Jr., a Christian, ordained Christian minister. As I have heard a Black minister explain recently, he was, first and foremost, above all a Christian minister. His belief in the Bible and his belief in Jesus Christ as a Savior was his guiding force, which brought him to the place that Jesus brought his disciples to, and that the Apostle Paul was brought to rather abruptly, and that is, Jesus did not discriminate against anyone and that we, who believe, as Christians, should follow those teachings and treat people equally, regardless of skin color. And that would help fulfill that part of Dr. King's dream, that people would be judged by the content of their character and not the color of their skin.

However, California has digressed, regressed to the point where no longer are they making progress toward racial harmony. They are going the other direction, saying that what we need is to segregate, like that great Democrat, George Wallace believed.

So it is unbelievable. We have supposed liberals in California not pursuing the dream of Dr. King, where people would be judged by the content of their character rather than the color of their skin; but we have these California universities that are now fulfilling the dream of the Democratic Party candidate, George Wallace, who felt like segregation in all things was the far better way to go.

So congratulations to the University of California System for helping fulfill the dream of George Wallace. What a wonderful combination we have. Not a progressive, as they might claim the name, but of regressives who are going back and claiming the dream, not of Dr. King, but of Democrat Party activist, George Wallace. Congratulations. You make a great pair, California University System, and George Wallace's dream. Wow.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. GOHMERT. We also have had mention tonight of efforts toward what some call sentencing reform. I was honored back in 2007 to get a call from a man that I think the world of, former Attorney General Ed Meese. Apparently he had heard of my concerns about some of the Federal criminal

laws that needed to be changed; that we had too many people in America who were being harassed and their lives or their families destroyed by Federal criminal law that allowed people to be prosecuted for violating, not a law that Congress had passed, but some regulation that some cubicle-holder had decided would be a good thing to do.

Unelected bureaucrats in Washington decided we will make this a regulation, and since Congress passed a law saying you have to follow all the laws and rules regarding this issue, we fall under the rules and regulations; therefore, they can go to prison for failing to do what we, as unelected bureaucrats in Washington, decided that someone somewhere we have never been must do.

So I was greatly in favor and encouraged to hear of the interest from the Heritage Foundation, former Attorney General Ed Meese, to pursue criminal justice reform.

We have had difficulty moving that forward, and I greatly appreciate the leadership of Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE. We have been able to get through some criminal justice reforms that I have been hoping to see passed since 2007.

At times we made strange bedfellows, politically speaking, I guess, when we had Ed Meese and others from the Heritage Foundation, along with leaders from the ACLU, who had similar concerns that we did, and we were coming together to try to correct great injustices within the criminal justice laws.

Unfortunately, the President, probably inspired by mentors like George Soros, they see that before criminal justice reform could be passed, at least contemporaneously, you have to pass sentencing reform.

The Obama administration wants that to be a major part of the Obama legacy. And when you see how many people are being completely failed and harmed by ObamaCare, I can certainly understand why President Obama would rather have his legacy be that of something in the criminal justice area rather than ObamaCare.

Without—and I have to say, this has certainly damaged in a bipartisan fashion people across America. There are people who have been helped by having government pay a good part of their health care.

You look at the bottom line, especially, from the people I have heard from all over east Texas, we have vast numbers complaining they have lost their insurance they liked. They lost the doctor that was keeping them healthy or had gotten them cured, and now they were back in trouble. They lost the doctor or the insurance company, they lost the hospital they wanted to go to, all because of that around-2500-page monstrosity that is normally referred to as ObamaCare. It is easier to call it ObamaCare than the Affordable Care Act because it is not affordable. It has cost some people every-thing.

So we have heard from people. They are clamoring for a change.

Isn't there some way to let us get back the insurance we had before 2010, when the President and every Democrat, without a single Republican vote, rammed through, against the majority will of the American public, this monstrosity where the government took over their healthcare insurance, dictated requirements that would put many out of business, dictated requirements of doctors that have caused many to retire, as they have advised me?

And I continue to hear, and we continue to lose hospitals especially in rural areas.

□ 2130

But when you hear uncaring, big city folks say, "We don't really care. Just tell them to move to the city," really? What? Like Chicago, where their chances of being murdered go up astronomically from where they are living now, where their standard of living can't possibly be where it is now? Do you despise these people so much and what many consider flyover territory that you would want to sentence them to such brutality? How about if we just let America be free again and we follow what so many have talked about?

It is why I had the bill drafted back in 2009. CBO Director Elmendorf, no matter what he asked, I complied, and they still refused to ever score my bill. Newt Gingrich had said back in early 2009: If you can just get this in bill form and get it scored, they won't have a chance of passing ObamaCare; this will be too good.

Because it appeared that the best numbers we could get back from 2008, it may well be cheaper to offer seniors: Okay, you want Medicare? You can have it. On the other hand, if you would like the very best health insurance policy that money can buy, we will buy it for you, but we will go ahead and set a high deductible.

Back then, we were talking \$5,000 or so. Maybe today it would be \$7,500 or \$10,000. We will have a high deductible, but above that deductible. You will have the best insurance money can buy, Mr. or Ms. Senior. To cover the deductible, we will give you a health savings account. We will put the cash in there.

I made this proposal to a couple of folks that I had invited to come out and listen to the proposal from AARP. Since they cared about retired folks, I figured they will love this because this is going to be so good for retired people. They will never have to buy another wraparound or supplemental policy again. This is going to be unbelievable. So for Medicare and Medicaid, this will be fantastic, and we will give each one of them a health savings account debit card, and it will be coded only.

Newt Gingrich was very helpful. He sent out some folks to meet with me that knew all about the different issues

and encouraged some different things to be in the bill we got in there. Anyway, this was going to be great for seniors. I was shocked when AARP folks said: We will have to get back with you because we are not sure. I said: How could you not be sure? You care about retired people.

My mother-in-law and father-in-law at the time were struggling to pay for a supplemental policy. This will be fantastic.

I was so naive. I didn't know that AARP was making hundreds of millions of dollars clear profit for a non-profit off selling the sale of supplemental health insurance.

So, naturally, they couldn't sign on to that bill. It was going to be so good for seniors that AARP would never be making those hundreds of millions and billions of dollars that they would be able to make under ObamaCare. Of course, they signed on to ObamaCare. It was in their monetary best interest, just like it has been in the Clintons' best interests to have Secretary Clinton have a husband out there raking in the money while providing access to those who may have wanted a favor in the administration. Access was the favor.

So we have had people across America so shocked. Money, as we were told, is not the root of all evil, but the love of money is a root of all evil—not necessarily "the," but "a" root of evil.

When we see what has happened to people's health care all over money and power and we see what has happened to the greed of entities that were just supposed to help the seniors, just supposed to help those less fortunate, well, they are making a fortune. When we look at what has happened to health care, the hospitals out of business, the doctors retired, people that can't get the help they used to have, it is heartbreaking to those who are actually paying attention.

In the meantime, we have an investigation by the FBI into all this money, tens of millions—hundreds of millions—of dollars flowing into the Clinton Foundation. When people heard FBI Director James Comey stand up and basically spell out a lay-down case against Hillary Clinton for violating the law that ultimately came to the conclusion that there is nothing behind this curtain, so no good prosecutor would consider prosecuting this case, he failed to talk to good prosecutors who were prosecuting cases in which they had much less to go on than what had already been admitted.

I was shocked when we heard that Hillary Clinton was going to be interviewed for 3 hours. Some people expected the FBI to give a statement opinion about the case the next week. I said that that won't happen because traditionally the FBI would get that statement, they would review sentence by sentence to see if there was anything that was false that was provided to them, and if she had a 3-hour interview, it will take time to go sentence

by sentence through what she said. There is no way they are coming back that next week.

Little did I know that—you know, you are left with the impression, what happened out there on the tarmac when this clandestine meeting between Attorney General Loretta Lynch and former President Bill Clinton met, it was before the statement was made. And as I pointed out, basically even to the Attorney General, it makes it look like that when President Clinton and Attorney General Lynch got together it was: Look, just tell your wife all we have got to do is check the box. We had a lengthy period of questioning. We won't even put her under oath. We won't even record it, so there is no way we can really effectively prosecute her because we won't have an accurate statement of what she said. Just tell her to come in. We will check the box. We can come out a few days later and announce there is nothing here, look the other way.

It sounded like a wink and nod: Oh, by the way, Hillary says she would like to keep you on as Attorney General.

Great. Let's get her in and get the statement so we can drop the case.

That is basically what sounds like happened because of the way it unfolded. That is not the way the FBI normally works. There are so many incredible criminal investigators in our FBI despite all the good ones that Director Mueller ran off because he wanted new investigators—not any of the people that had been around and had wisdom and experience, but the new ones. They are there for proper reasons. They want to see justice done. And so people were shocked when the announcement came, hey, they laid out the elements of the case. Obviously, it sounded like they were proven. And then it says, so no good prosecutor, in effect, would pursue this.

There was no evidence of intent when somebody has a software program that is actually purchased with the sole purpose of destroying any way to get back to the emails that, now, it appears, were destroyed after they were requested, after they were subpoenaed, and after they were being sought. So, obviously, that is a lay-down case for intent right there.

Then we find out that phones were bashed perhaps with a hammer. Maybe if you were in some area of the country trying to prosecute where people are just going to acquit no matter what happens, okay, maybe, yeah, a prosecutor there might not pursue, but in most of this God-blessed country, if you show somebody that there was actual destruction with a hammer of cellphones to prevent anybody from ever finding out what was on there, you show them that software was actually purchased that would completely bleach and destroy any ability to go back and get those emails, most normal people would have no problem whatsoever finding an intent to deceive there and have no problem finding lies that were made.

But we heard over and over, gee, FBI Director Comey would never do anything but absolutely perfectly above-board.

But then this article by Patrick Howley, 10 September, came out. I was shocked. It said: “A review of FBI Director James Comey’s professional history and relationships shows that the Obama cabinet leader—now under fire for his handling of the investigation of Hillary Clinton—is deeply entrenched in the big-money cronyism culture of Washington, D.C. His personal and professional relationships—all undisclosed as he announced the Bureau would not prosecute Clinton—reinforce bipartisan concerns that he may have politicized the criminal probe.

“These concerns focus on millions of dollars that Comey accepted from a Clinton Foundation defense contractor, Comey’s former membership on a Clinton Foundation corporate partner’s board”—I had no idea—and his surprising financial relationship with his brother Peter Comey, who works at the law firm that does the Clinton Foundation taxes.”

Who knew? Wow. Direct ties here with FBI Director James Comey’s family and the Clinton Foundation. It is just amazing. I don’t hold anybody’s former employer against them. Fine, you are employed hopefully by somebody, so I wouldn’t hold that against them. Certainly, Hank—I don’t even want to say his name, but he used to be the Secretary of the Treasury, and—well, yeah, he deserves to be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yet again. Hank Paulson, the former chairman of Goldman Sachs, he certainly did every favor he possibly could to Goldman Sachs, and they are still going on.

But here are some holdings, HSBC Holdings the article mentioned. “In 2013, Comey became a board member, a director, and a Financial System Vulnerabilities Committee member of the London bank HSBC Holdings. ‘Mr. Comey’s appointment will be for an initial three-year term which, subject to re-election by shareholders, will expire at the conclusion of the 2016 Annual General Meeting,’ according to HSBC company records.

“HSBC Holdings and its various philanthropic branches routinely partner with the Clinton Foundation. For instance, HSBC Holdings has partnered with Deutsche Bank through the Clinton Foundation to ‘retrofit 1,500 to 2,500 housing units, primarily in the low- to moderate-income sector’ in ‘New York City.’”

Anyway, it goes on to talk about Peter Comey.

“When our source called the Chinatown offices of D.C. law firm DLA Piper and asked for ‘Peter Comey,’ a receptionist immediately put him through to Comey’s direct line. But Peter Comey is not featured on the DLA Piper website.

“Peter Comey serves as ‘Senior Director of Real Estate Operations for the Americas’ for DLA Piper.

□ 2145

“James Comey was not questioned about his relationship with Peter Comey in his confirmation hearing. DLA Piper is the firm that performed the independent audit of the Clinton Foundation in November during Clinton-World’s first big push to put the email scandal behind them. DLA Piper’s employees taken as a whole represent a major Hillary Clinton 2016 campaign donation bloc and Clinton Foundation donation base.

“DLA Piper ranks number 5 on Hillary Clinton’s all-time career Top Contributors list, just ahead of Goldman Sachs. And here is another thing: Peter Comey has a mortgage on his house that is owned by his brother” James Comey, the FBI director. Peter Comey’s financial records obtained by Breitbart News showed that he “bought a \$950,000 house in Vienna, Virginia, in June 2008. He needed a \$712,500 mortgage from First Savings Mortgage Corporation.

“But on January 31, 2011, James Comey and his wife stepped in to become Private Party lenders. They granted a mortgage on the house for \$711,000.”

Anyway, it is just rather interesting: Who had any idea that the Comey family had such ties to the Clinton Foundation?

“Peter Comey redesigned the FBI building.”

Well, that is interesting.

“FBI Director James Comey grew up in the New Jersey suburbs with his brother Peter.”

Anyway, interesting. How about that. Peter Comey redesigned the FBI building, according to the article.

“Procon Consulting’s client list includes ‘FBI Headquarters, Washington, D.C.’

“So what did Procon Consulting do for FBI headquarters? Quite a bit, apparently. According to the firm’s records: Procon provided strategic project management for the consolidation of over 11,000 FBI personnel into one, high security, facility.”

Then it goes on. As the article ends, it says:

“This is not going to end well.”

Well, fortunately, for Hillary Clinton, the investigation with the Clinton Foundation ties to the FBI director has ended well for her.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUTHRIE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and September 13 on account of family obligations.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ROSS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of flight delays.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2040. An act to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 13, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Of-

ficial Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MATTHEW B. KELLOGG, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 24 AND JULY 2, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Matthew B. Kellogg	6/26	6/28	Japan		696.00		(³)				696.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MATTHEW B. KELLOGG, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 24 AND JULY 2, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	6/28	6/30	China		507.00		(³)				507.00
	6/30	7/2	South Korea		499.00		(³)				499.00
Committee total					1,702.00						1,702.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

MATTHEW B. KELLOGG, July 19, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TUNISIA, KENYA, AND SENEGAL, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 24 AND JULY 1, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Vern Buchanan	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Hon. David Price	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Hon. Dina Titus	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Hon. Lois Capps	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Jeff Billman	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Justin Wein	6/27	6/30	Kenya		1,080.00		(³)				1,080.00
Hon. Vern Buchanan	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Hon. David Price	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Hon. Adrian Smith	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Hon. Gwen Moore	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Hon. Dina Titus	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Hon. Lois Capps	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Jeff Billman	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Justin Wein	6/24	6/27	Tunisia		584.97		(³)				584.97
Hon. Vern Buchanan	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Hon. David Price	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Hon. Adrian Smith	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Hon. Gwen Moore	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Hon. Dina Titus	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Hon. Lois Capps	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Jeff Billman	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Justin Wein	6/30	7/1	Senegal		137.13		(³)				137.13
Committee total					14,416.80						14,416.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. VERN BUCHANAN, July 26, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NETHERLANDS, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 25 AND JUNE 28, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		8,580.00				9,126.00
Hon. Jim Costa	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		739.00				1,285.00
Hon. John Carter	6/26	7/2	The Netherlands		546.00		1,581.00				2,127.00
Hon. Bill Huizenga	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		2,613.00				3,159.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		2,101.00				2,647.00
Hon. Ami Bera	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		1,645.00				2,191.00
Janice Robinson	6/25	6/28	The Netherlands		819.00		1,472.00				2,291.00
Marie Spear	6/25	6/28	The Netherlands		819.00		1,476.00				2,295.00
Jason Steinbaum	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		1,864.00				2,410.00
Angela Ellard	6/26	6/28	The Netherlands		546.00		1,476.00				2,022.00
Committee total					6,006.00		23,547.00				29,553.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART, July 27, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.84		7,581.40		58.09		8,607.33
	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		939.51		878.40		66.89		1,884.80
	5/7	5/9	Ghana		531.85		987.20		3.12		1,522.17
	5/9	5/9	USA				4,699.36				4,699.36
Hon. Daniel Benishek	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.84		7,581.40		219.60		8,768.84
	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		939.51		878.40		61.05		1,878.96
	5/7	5/9	Ghana		531.85		987.20				1,519.05
	5/9	5/9	USA				4,699.36				4,699.36
Hon. David Rouzer	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.87		7,581.40		163.40		8,712.64
	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		939.51		878.40		102.61		1,920.52
	5/7	5/9	Ghana		531.85		987.20				1,519.05
	5/9	5/9	USA				4,699.36				4,699.36
Hon. Sean Patrick Maloney	4/30	5/4	Jordan		924.06		3,947.20		327.93		5,199.19
	5/4	5/4	USA				4,041.86				4,041.86
Scott Graves	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.84		7,581.40		370.68		8,919.92
	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		631.36		878.40		40.54		1,550.30
	5/6	5/6	USA				5,508.18				5,508.18
Bart Fischer	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.84		7,581.40		155.46		8,704.70

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Larew	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		939.51		878.40		62.71		1,880.62
	5/7	5/9	Ghana		531.85		987.20		28.05		1,547.10
	5/9	5/9	USA				4,123.36				4,123.36
	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.84		7,581.40		75.15		8,624.39
	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		939.51		878.40		177.21		1,996.12
Mark Williams	5/7	5/9	Ghana		531.85		987.20		7.01		1,526.06
	5/9	5/9	USA				4,123.36				4,123.36
	4/30	5/4	Jordan		967.84		7,581.40		259.05		8,808.29
	5/4	5/6	Ethiopia		939.51		878.40		105.39		1,923.30
	5/7	5/9	Ghana		531.85		987.20				1,519.05
Committee total	5/9	5/9	USA				4,123.36				4,123.36
					17,158.46		105,107.20		2,283.94		124,549.60

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, July 22, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Valerie Baldwin	3/29	3/31	Jordan		710.82				43.72		
	3/31	4/2	Israel		1,036.00				72.97		
	4/2	4/4	Egypt		718.00				131.61		
	4/4	5/5	United Arab Emirates		489.31						
Commercial airfare							12,578.92				
Taxi							85.00				
Kris Mallard	3/29	3/31	Jordan		710.82				43.72		
	3/31	4/2	Israel		1,036.00				72.97		
	4/2	4/4	Egypt		718.00				131.61		
	4/4	5/5	United Arab Emirates		489.31						
Commercial airfare							12,578.92				
Taxi							99.67				
Chris Romig	3/29	3/31	Jordan		710.82				43.72		
	3/31	4/2	Israel		1,036.00				72.97		
	4/2	4/4	Egypt		718.00				131.61		
	4/4	5/5	United Arab Emirates		489.31						
Commercial airfare							12,578.92				
Taxi							93.76				
Laura Cylke	3/29	3/31	Jordan		710.82				43.72		
	3/31	4/2	Israel		1,036.00				72.97		
	4/2	4/4	Egypt		718.00				131.61		
	4/4	5/5	United Arab Emirates		489.31						
Commercial airfare							12,578.92				
Taxi							22.50				
Hon. C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger	3/29	3/30	Israel		654.61						
	3/30	3/31	United Arab Emirates		679.53				147.08		
	3/31	4/1	Bahrain		520.16				53.81		
	4/1	4/2	Iraq		1,220.63						
CODEL expenses	4/2	4/3	Spain		203.48				74.44		
Hon. Steve Israel	3/29	3/30	Israel		654.61				103.09		
	3/30	3/31	United Arab Emirates		679.53				147.08		
	3/31	4/1	Bahrain		520.16				53.81		
	4/1	4/2	Iraq		1,220.63						
CODEL expenses	4/2	4/3	Spain		224.70				74.44		
Hon. Tim Ryan	3/29	3/30	Israel		654.61				103.09		
	3/30	3/31	United Arab Emirates		679.53				147.08		
	3/31	4/1	Bahrain		520.16				53.81		
	4/1	4/2	Iraq		1,220.63						
CODEL expenses	4/2	4/3	Spain		224.70				74.44		
Hon. David W. Jolly	3/29	3/30	Israel		498.00				1,180.31		
	3/30	3/31	Saudi Arabia		486.00				304.33		
	3/31	4/1	Turkey		290.00				206.07		
	4/1	4/2	Egypt		1,234.00						
Hon. Martha Roby	4/2	4/3	Spain		376.45		(³)		443.24		
	4/30	5/5	Afghanistan								
Commercial airfare							18,369.26				
Hon. David G. Valadao	5/1	5/4	Egypt		1,234.00						
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63						
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.51						
	5/8	5/9	United Kingdom		809.00						
Hon. Chris Stewart	5/29	6/2	China		1,055.43				487.98		
							872.50				
Hon. David P. Joyce	6/24	6/27	Panama		952.00						
							563.21				
Committee total					30,015.78		70,421.58		4,750.39		105,187.75

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, August 1, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to Austria, Jordan, Israel, Ireland—March 28–April 2, 2016 with CODEL McCaskill											
Hon. Susan Davis	3/29	3/30	Austria	421.68	421.68

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Niki Tsongas	3/30	3/31	Jordan		262.33						262.33
	3/31	4/1	Israel		397.93						397.93
	4/1	4/2	Ireland		421.68						421.68
	3/29	3/30	Austria		421.68						421.68
	3/30	3/31	Jordan		262.33						262.33
Craig Greene	3/31	4/1	Israel		470.93						470.93
	4/1	4/2	Ireland		470.93						470.93
	3/29	3/30	Austria		521.61						521.61
	3/30	3/31	Jordan		403.33						403.33
	3/31	4/1	Israel		546.00						546.00
Travel to Israel, United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Iraq, Spain—March 28–April 3, 2016 with CODEL Donnelly	4/1	4/2	Ireland								
Hon. Seth Moulton	3/29	3/30	Israel		571.00						571.00
	3/30	3/31	United Arab Emirates		536.00						536.00
	3/31	4/1	Bahrain		396.81						396.81
	4/1	4/2	Iraq		11.00		1,200.00				1,211.00
	4/2	4/3	Spain		203.48						203.48
Travel to Afghanistan, India, United Arab Emirates—April 30–May 6, 2016											
Hon. Martha McCally	5/1	5/3	Afghanistan		40.00						40.00
	5/3	5/4	India		109.00						109.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/1	5/3	Afghanistan		40.00						40.00
Hon. Gwen Graham	5/1	5/3	Afghanistan		40.00						40.00
Jaime Cheshire	5/1	5/3	Afghanistan		40.00						40.00
Craig Greene	5/1	5/3	Afghanistan		40.00						40.00
Katy Quinn	5/1	5/3	Afghanistan		40.00						40.00
Delegation expenses			India						83.84		83.84
Delegation expenses			Afghanistan						1,070.21		1,070.21
Travel to Israel, Jordan, Sweden, Germany—May 26–June 3, 2016											
Hon. Mike Rogers	5/27	5/28	Sweden		423.67						423.67
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		709.30						709.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		309.33						309.33
Hon. Brad Ashford	5/27	5/28	Sweden		423.67						423.67
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		709.30						709.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		309.33						309.33
Hon. Joe Wilson	5/27	5/28	Sweden		423.67						423.67
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		709.30						709.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		309.33						309.33
Timothy Morrison	5/27	5/28	Sweden		423.67						423.67
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		709.30						709.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		275.42						275.42
Stephen Kitay	5/27	5/28	Sweden		423.67						423.67
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		709.30						709.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		275.42						275.42
Leonor Tomero	5/27	5/28	Sweden		423.67						423.67
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		709.30						709.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		275.42						275.42
Travel to South Africa—May 28–June 6, 2016 with CODEL Coons											
Hon. Brad Byrne	5/30	6/5	South Africa		1,186.19						1,186.19
Hon. Marc Veasey	5/30	6/5	South Africa		1,186.19						1,186.19
Travel to South Korea, Japan—June 4–June 9, 2016											
David Giachetti	6/5	6/6	South Korea		366.00						366.00
	6/8	6/9	Japan		398.58						398.58
Commercial transportation							43,729.85				43,729.85
Craig Greene	6/5	6/6	South Korea		366.00						366.00
	6/8	6/9	Japan		398.58						398.58
Commercial transportation							43,729.85				43,729.85
Alison Lynn	6/5	6/6	South Korea		366.00						366.00
	6/8	6/9	Japan		398.58						398.58
Commercial transportation							43,729.85				43,729.85
Delegation expenses			South Korea				653.03				653.03
Travel to Senegal, Mali—June 25–June 30, 2016											
Mark Morehouse	6/26	6/28	Senegal		514.68						514.68
	6/28	6/30	Mali		313.80						313.80
Commercial transportation							16,664.66				16,664.66
Katy Quinn	6/26	6/28	Senegal		514.68						514.68
	6/28	6/30	Mali		313.80						313.80
Commercial transportation							16,664.66				16,664.66
Daniel Sennott	6/26	6/28	Senegal		514.68						514.68
	6/28	6/30	Mali		313.80						313.80
Commercial transportation							16,664.66				16,664.66
Commercial total					30,442.74		183,036.56		1,154.05		214,633.35

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAC THORNBERRY, Chairman, August 16, 2016

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Kline	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,638.00		(³)				1,638
Hon. David “Phil” Roe	3/30	3/31	USA				* 677.70				677.70
			Philippines		* 186.98						186.98
			Australia		* 636.00						636.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,638.00		(³)				1,638.00
		4/7	Australia				1,168.86				1,168.86
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,638.00		(³)				1,638.00
Juliane Sullivan	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,689.00		(³)				1,689.00
Janelle Gardner	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,662.00		(³)				1,662.00
Brian Newell	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,689.00		(³)				1,689.00
Elizabeth Podgorski	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,478.00		(³)				1,478.00
Richard Miller	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,662.00		(³)				1,662.00
Krisann Pearce	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,662.00		(³)				1,662.00
Committee total					20,031.54		1,846.56				22,878.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

* Traveler departed trip state-side due to a death in the family. Post was unable to cancel hotel rooms in Manila and Sydney.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, July 14, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Adam Kinzinger	3/29	3/30	Israel		498.61		(³)				498.61
	3/30	3/31	Saudi Arabia		459.45						459.45
	3/31	4/1	Turkey		315.20						315.20
	4/1	4/2	Egypt		534.32						534.32
	4/2	4/4	Spain		258.85						258.85
Hon. Fred Upton	5/27	5/28	Morocco		383.94		(³)				383.94
	3/29	6/1	South Africa		1,323.63			2,632.71			3,956.34
	6/1	6/2	Botswana		288.84						288.84
	6/2	6/3	Cape Verde		151.24						151.24
Joan Hillebrands	5/27	5/28	Morocco		383.94		(³)				383.94
	5/29	6/1	South Africa		1,323.63						1,323.63
	6/1	6/2	Botswana		288.84						288.84
	6/2	6/3	Cape Verde		151.24						151.24
Hon. Billy Long	5/27	5/28	Sweden		427.00		(³)				427.00
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		992.00						992.00
	6/2	6/3	Germany		203.00						203.00
Hon. Gus Bilirakis	5/27	5/29	Cyprus		584.96		13,720.49				14,305.45
	5/29	5/30	Israel		498.00						498.00
Hon. Bill Flores	5/30	6/2	Taiwan		744.14		13,127.56				13,871.70
	6/2	6/4	South Korea		690.18						690.18
David Redl	6/27	6/30	Finland		836.81		1,761.46				2,598.27
Charlotte Savercool	6/27	6/30	Finland		836.81		1,761.46				2,598.27
Gerald Leverich	6/27	6/30	Finland		836.81		1,864.26				2,701.07
Committee total					14,505.44		32,235.23		2,632.71		49,373.38

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, July 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. French Hill	4/1	4/3	Russia		804.00						804.00
	4/3	4/4	Poland		271.92		7,173.20				7,445.12
Hon. Juan Vargas	4/1	4/3	Russia		949.00						949.00
	4/3	4/5	Poland		543.84						543.84
	4/5	4/7	Czech Republic		737.66						737.66
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		506.00		44.00				550.00
	4/9	4/12	Austria		870.05		12,655.66				13,525.71
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/3	4/5	Colombia		572.07						572.07
	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/8	Paraguay		715.32		226.70		11,201.89		12,143.91
	4/8	4/8	Argentina				8,142.62		1,290.79		9,433.41
Hon. Robert Pittenger	4/3	4/5	Colombia		586.92						586.92
	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/8	Paraguay		743.03		226.70				969.73
	4/8	4/8	Argentina						9,518.61		9,518.61
Joseph Pinder	4/3	4/5	Colombia		607.75						607.75
	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/8	Paraguay		815.00		226.70				1,041.70
	4/8	4/8	Argentina				7,801.31				7,801.31
Hon. Keith Ellison	4/3	4/5	Colombia		376.90						376.90
	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/8	Paraguay		722.06		226.70				948.76
	4/8	4/8	Argentina				8,063.81				8,063.81
Lisa Peto	5/12	5/15	France		1,327.75		1,123.56				2,451.31
Hon. Randy Neugebauer	5/27	5/28	Sweden		396.87		(³)				396.87
	5/28	5/31	Israel		1,396.98		(³)				1,396.98

September 12, 2016

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H5331

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	5/31	6/2	Jordan		679.30		(³)				679.30
	6/2	6/3	Germany		301.15		(³)				301.15
Hon. Robert Pittenger	6/19	6/21	Austria		686.00		10,251.26		354.24		11,291.50
Hon. Juan Vargas	6/25	6/27	Egypt		534.00						534.00
	6/27	6/30	Jordan		1,064.82						1,064.82
	6/30	7/2	Turkey		545.31		10,736.66				11,381.97
Hon. Robert Pittenger	6/25	6/27	Egypt		534.00						534.00
	6/27	6/30	Jordan		1,063.00		15,300.06				16,363.06
Committee total					18,450.70		91,717.55				123,015.17

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, July 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	5/27	5/29	Cyprus		476.96		17,501.19		* 6,055.62		24,033.77
	5/29	6/2	Israel		1,767.00				* 16,236.30		18,003.30
Hon. Randy Weber	5/27	5/29	Cyprus		489.96		12,869.79				13,359.76
	5/29	6/2	Israel		1,769.00						1,769.00
Edward Acevedo	5/27	5/29	Cyprus		513.96		6,721.99				7,235.95
	5/29	6/2	Israel		1,795.00						1,795.00
Nathan Gately	5/27	5/29	Cyprus		544.96		6,721.99				7,266.95
	5/29	6/2	Israel		1,804.00						1,804.00
Hon. Edward Royce	4/2	4/4	Jordan		710.00		13,468.00				14,178.00
	4/4	4/6	Iraq		22.00		(³)				22.00
	4/6	4/8	Tunisia		624.00						624.00
Hon. Lois Frankel	4/2	4/4	Jordan		531.75		12,881.96				13,413.71
	4/4	4/6	Iraq		22.00		(³)				22.00
	4/6	4/8	Tunisia		536.25						536.25
Elizabeth Heng	4/2	4/4	Jordan		670.00		12,848.96				13,518.96
	4/4	4/6	Iraq		22.00		(³)				22.00
	4/6	4/8	Tunisia		597.00						597.00
Cory Fritz	4/2	4/4	Jordan		710.00		13,304.16				14,014.16
	4/4	4/6	Iraq				(³)				
	4/6	4/8	Tunisia		624.00						624.00
Kristen Marquardt	4/2	4/4	Jordan		685.35		12,035.16				12,720.51
	4/4	4/6	Iraq		22.00		(³)				22.00
	4/6	4/8	Tunisia		601.88						601.88
Joan Condon	3/29	3/31	South Sudan		160.00		5,385.78				5,545.78
	3/31	4/4	Ethiopia		735.00		126.00				861.00
Worku Gachou	3/29	3/31	South Sudan		165.00		5,385.78				5,550.78
	3/31	4/4	Ethiopia		735.00		126.00				861.00
Joseph Howell	3/29	3/31	South Sudan		160.00		7,682.38				7,842.38
	3/31	4/4	Ethiopia		735.00		126.00				861.00
Kristen Marquardt	5/2	5/5	Pakistan		159.00		11,493.56				11,652.56
	5/5	5/7	Afghanistan		12.00						12.00
Sajit Gandhi	5/2	5/5	Pakistan		159.00		11,021.00				11,180.00
	5/5	5/7	Afghanistan		12.00						12.00
Scott Cullinane	4/3	4/7	Georgia		1,003.00		2,345.36				3,348.36
	4/7	4/10	Armenia		785.00						785.00
Nilmini Rubin	5/31	6/5	Israel		2,466.00		1,560.99		* 1,873.64		5,900.63
Brian Skretny	5/31	6/5	Israel		2,488.00		1,560.99				4,048.99
Mira Resnick	5/31	6/2	Israel		1,020.00		1,836.49				2,856.49
Hon. David Cicilline	5/31	6/5	South Africa		1,184.86		15,020.66				16,205.52
Hon. Ted Deutch	6/28	7/1	Israel		1,902.00		11,662.79				13,564.79
Casey Kustin	6/28	7/1	Israel		1,902.00		11,426.79				13,328.79
Edward Acevedo	5/1	5/4	Honduras		878.00		1,130.56				2,008.56
	5/4	5/6	Guatemala		468.00						468.00
	5/6	5/8	Nicaragua		467.00						467.00
Sadaf Khan	5/1	5/4	Honduras		884.00		1,130.56				2,014.56
	5/4	5/6	Guatemala		475.00						475.00
	5/6	5/8	Nicaragua		469.00						469.00
Mark Walker	5/1	5/4	Honduras		887.00		1,130.56				2,017.56
	5/4	5/6	Guatemala		471.00						471.00
	5/6	5/8	Nicaragua		470.00						470.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	3/26	3/29	Indonesia		362.00		11,517.36				11,879.36
	3/30	4/2	Australia		506.30						506.30
	4/2	4/6	New Zealand		503.93						503.93
Amy Chang	3/26	3/29	Indonesia		362.00		11,543.96				11,905.96
	3/30	4/2	Australia		506.30						506.30
	4/2	4/6	New Zealand		503.93						503.93
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	4/1	4/3	Russia		949.00		17,206.52		* 1,377.55		19,533.07
	4/3	4/5	Poland		543.84				* 5,848.00		6,391.84
	4/5	4/7	Czech Republic		737.66				* 1,057.27		1,794.93
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		506.00				* 677.07		1,183.07
	4/9	4/12	Austria		870.05						870.05
Hon. David Cicilline	4/1	4/3	Russia		949.00		10,170.12				11,119.12
	4/3	4/5	Poland		543.84						543.84
	4/5	4/7	Czech Republic		737.66						737.66
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		506.00						506.00
Hon. Brian Higgins	4/1	4/3	Russia		949.00		8,637.21				9,586.21
	4/3	4/5	Poland		543.84						543.84
	4/5	4/7	Czech Republic		737.66						737.66
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		506.00						506.00
	4/9	4/12	Austria		870.05						870.05
Paul Behrends	4/1	4/3	Russia		949.00		11,879.02				12,828.02
	4/3	4/5	Poland		543.84						543.84
	4/5	4/7	Czech Republic		737.66						737.66
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		506.00						506.00
	4/9	4/12	Austria		870.05						870.05
Philip Bednarczyk	4/1	4/3	Russia		926.00		4,425.92				5,351.92
	4/3	4/5	Poland		544.00						544.00
	4/5	4/7	Czech Republic		832.00						832.00
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		506.00						506.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Thomas Hill	4/9	4/12	Austria		996.00						996.00
	3/28	3/31	Egypt		801.55		3,906.06				4,707.61
	3/31	4/2	Tunisia		420.52						420.52
Russell Solomon	3/28	3/31	Egypt		801.55		3,906.06				4,707.61
	3/31	4/2	Tunisia		420.52						420.52
Edward Acevedo	3/28	3/31	Egypt		724.00		3,906.06				4,630.06
	3/31	4/2	Tunisia		387.00						387.00
Nathan Gately	3/28	3/31	Egypt		790.00		3,906.06				4,686.06
	3/31	4/2	Tunisia		406.00						406.00
Hunter Strupp	4/3	4/9	India		1,739.90		12,456.77		* 142.42		14,339.09
Sajit Gandhi	4/3	4/10	India		1,895.51		11,881.17				13,776.68
Hunter Strupp	5/2	5/8	Vietnam		1,183.87		12,682.96		* 300.24		14,167.07
Audra McGeorge	5/2	5/8	Vietnam		1,213.95		12,682.96				13,896.91
Hon. Edward Royce	5/30	6/2	Taiwan		762.00		3,854.16		* 2,105.94		6,722.10
	6/2	6/4	South Korea		960.00						960.00
Shelley Su	5/30	6/2	Taiwan		762.00		14,831.00				15,593.00
	6/2	6/4	South Korea		960.00						960.00
Cory Fritz	5/30	6/2	Taiwan		762.00		14,729.90				15,491.90
	6/2	6/4	South Korea		960.00						960.00
Hon. Jeff Duncan	6/24	6/28	Panama		1,116.00		685.21				1,801.21
Committee total					73,951.91		373,313.93		* 35,674.05		482,939.89

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

*Indicates Delegation Costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, July 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
STAFFDEL Anstine											
Paul Anstine	3/29	3/31	Japan		822.74		* 18,426.36				19,249.10
	3/31	4/2	Singapore		809.99						809.99
	4/2	4/3	Indonesia		361.50						1,436.86
	4/4	4/6	Australia		1,436.86						1,436.86
S. Giaier	3/29	3/31	Japan		822.74		* 18,426.36				19,249.10
	3/31	4/2	Singapore		809.99						809.99
	4/2	4/3	Indonesia		361.50						361.50
	4/4	4/6	Australia		1,436.86						1,436.86
A. Sifuentes Carnes	3/29	3/31	Japan		822.74		* 18,426.36				19,249.10
	3/31	4/2	Singapore		809.99						809.99
	4/2	4/3	Indonesia		361.50						361.50
	4/4	4/6	Australia		1,436.86						1,436.86
Other Expenses: Meeting room	4/3	4/3	Indonesia					556.39			556.39
CODER Ratcliffe											
Hon. John Ratcliffe	5/2	5/6	Israel		2,184.00		11,905.39				14,089.39
Hon. James R. Langevin	5/2	5/6	Israel		2,184.00		8,774.29				10,958.29
B. Dewitt	5/2	5/6	Israel		2,184.00		11,773.39				13,957.39
E. Peterson	5/2	5/6	Israel		2,184.00		11,773.39				13,957.39
C. Schepis	5/2	5/6	Israel		2,184.00		11,773.39				13,957.39
Other, M&IE for Embassy Staff, etc.	5/2	5/6	Israel					13,376.37			13,376.37
CODER McCaul											
Hon. Michael T. McCaul	5/1	5/4	Egypt		1,759.00		(³)				1,759.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		833.00		(³)				833.00
B. Shields	5/1	5/4	Egypt		709.00		(³)				709.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
L. Fullerton	5/1	5/4	Egypt		709.00		(³)				709.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
E. Heighberger	5/1	5/4	Egypt		709.00		(³)				709.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.51		(³)				520.51
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
M. Taylor	5/1	5/4	Egypt		709.00		(³)				709.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
S. Phalen	5/1	5/4	Egypt		709.00		(³)				709.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
H. Goins	5/1	5/4	Egypt		709.00		(³)				709.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.51		(³)				520.51
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
Hon. William R. Keating	5/1	5/4	Egypt		1,759.00		(³)				1,759.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		833.00		(³)				833.00
Hon. Tom Rice	5/1	5/4	Egypt		1,234.00		(³)				1,234.00
	5/4	5/6	Bahrain		793.63		(³)				793.63
	5/6	5/8	Tunisia		520.52		(³)				520.52
	5/8	5/9	England		809.00		(³)				809.00
OT, misc. supplies, control room, etc.	5/1	5/4	Egypt					20,550.90			20,550.90
Staff OT, control room, etc.	5/4	5/6	Bahrain					922.03			922.03
LES OT, mileage, wreath, etc.	5/6	5/8	Tunisia					2,855.85			2,855.85
Transportation, OT, control room, etc.	5/8	5/9	England					7,095.88			7,095.88
Committee total					49,375.60		111,278.93		45,357.42		206,011.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

* Airfare inclusive of multiple legs of trip.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCaul, Chairman, July 28, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Chairman, July 22, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Cohen	5/31	6/5	South Africa		471.00		15,235.66		715.19		16,421.85
Hon. Suzan DelBene	5/31	6/5	South Africa		471.00		7,602.10		715.19		8,788.29
Committee total					942.00		22,837.76		1,430.38		25,210.14

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, July 27, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Stephen Lynch	3/29	3/30	Israel		571.00						571.00
	3/30	3/31	UAE		538.00						538.00
	3/31	4/1	Bahrain		377.00						377.00
	4/1	4/2	Iraq		11.00						11.00
	4/2	4/3	Spain		245.00						245.00
Hon. Cynthia Lummis	3/26	3/30	Indonesia		1,086.00		14,317.00				15,403.00
	3/30	4/2	Australia		1,089.00						1,089.00
	4/2	4/6	New Zealand		1,135.00						1,135.00
Hon. Dimple Shah	5/29	5/31	Greece		404.00		16,028.00				16,432.00
	5/31	6/2	France		931.00						931.00
	6/2	6/3	Belgium		309.00						309.00
Valerie Shen	5/29	5/31	Greece		404.00		16,028.00				16,432.00
	5/31	6/2	France		931.00						931.00
	6/2	6/3	Belgium		309.00						309.00
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/27	5/29	Cyprus		395.00		10,549.00				10,944.00
Hon. Cynthia Lummis	5/28	6/2	China		1,381.00						1,381.00
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	5/28	6/2	China		1,381.00						1,381.00
	6/12	6/13	U.K.		362.00		1,279.00				1,641.00
Cordell Hull	6/12	6/13	U.K.		474.00		734.00				1,208.00
Committee total					12,333.00		58,935.00				71,268.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ, Chairman, July 29, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. STEVE CHABOT, Chairman, July 26, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, July 28, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/31	4/1	Philippine		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/6	Australia		1,631.00		(³)				1,631.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/24	3/27	Japan		1,336.00		(³)				1,336.00
	3/27	3/29	South Korea		927.50		(³)				927.50
	3/30	4/2	Australia		503.00		(³)				503.00
Hon. Tom Rice	3/29	3/30	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	3/30	3/31	Saudi Arabia		486.00		(³)				486.00
	3/31	4/1	Turkey		290.00		(³)				290.00
	4/1	4/3	Egypt		1,234.00		(³)				1,234.00
	4/3	4/4	Spain		376.45		(³)				376.45
Hon. John Lewis	5/31	6/4	South Africa		1,192.46		15,019.56				16,212.02
Committee total					9,080.25		15,019.56				24,099.81

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. KEVIN BRADY, Chairman, July 27, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/3	4/5	Asia		1,036.00				1,854.68		2,890.68
	4/5	4/6	Asia		710.82		101.99				993.27
	4/6	4/6	Asia						71.53		71.53
	4/7	4/8	Africa		267.00				269.20		536.20
	4/8	4/10	Europe		802.00		258.13		225.99		1,286.12
Damon Nelson	4/3	4/5	Asia		1,036.00				1,854.68		2,890.68
	4/5	4/6	Asia		710.82		101.99		180.46		993.27
	4/6	4/6	Asia						71.53		71.53
	4/7	4/8	Africa		267.00				269.20		536.20
	4/8	4/10	Europe		802.00		258.13		225.99		1,286.12
Hon. Jeff Miller	4/4	4/9	Europe		1,906.68				143.85		2,050.53
Commercial airfare							8,214.36				8,214.36
George Pappas	4/4	4/9	Europe		2,383.34				143.85		2,527.19
Commercial airfare							2,118.29				2,118.29
Hon. Adam Schiff	5/1	5/6	Asia		1,864.00				2,524.59		4,388.59
Commercial airfare							11,993.19				11,993.19
Hon. Michael Quigley	5/1	5/6	Asia		1,864.00				2,524.59		4,388.59
Commercial airfare							12,750.39				12,750.39
Michael Bahar	5/1	5/6	Asia		2,244.00				2,524.59		4,768.59
Commercial airfare							10,320.39				10,320.39
Thomas Eager	5/1	5/6	Asia		2,244.00				2,524.59		4,768.59
Commercial airfare							12,463.19				12,463.19
Hon. Jackie Speier	5/2	5/3	Asia		715.00				19.68		715.00
	5/4	5/6	Asia		496.00				19.68		515.68
Commercial airfare							13,530.86				13,530.86
Tim Bergreen	5/2	5/3	Asia		715.00						715.00
	5/4	5/6	Asia		496.00				19.68		515.68
Commercial airfare							14,582.46				14,582.46
Andrew House	5/2	5/3	Asia		715.00						715.00
	5/4	5/6	Asia		496.00				19.68		515.68
Commercial airfare							13,844.06				13,844.06
Hon. Mike Pompeo	5/2	5/4	Africa		709.00				653.58		1,362.58
	5/4	5/6	Asia		793.63				76.84		870.47
	5/6	5/8	Africa		520.51				237.99		758.50
	5/8	5/9	Europe		833.00		193.62		506.85		1,533.47
Hon. Devin Nunes	5/3	5/5	Europe		1,235.00		808.50				2,043.50
	5/5	5/8	Europe		620.96				1,187.74		1,808.70
Commercial air fare							9,158.16				9,158.16
George Pappas	5/3	5/5	Europe		1,235.00		808.50				2,043.50
	5/5	5/8	Europe		620.97				1,187.74		1,808.71
Commercial air fare							1,790.66				1,790.66
Andrew House	5/29	5/31	Africa		970.00				177.27		1,147.27
	5/31	6/1	Africa		783.23						783.23
	6/1	6/2	Africa		240.00						240.00
	6/2	6/5	Africa		818.17						818.17
	6/5	6/8	Africa		614.34				6.92		621.26
Commercial airfare							9,072.06				9,072.06
Tim Bergreen	5/29	5/31	Africa		970.00				177.27		1,147.27
	5/31	6/01	Africa		783.23						783.23
	6/1	6/2	Africa		240.00						240.00
	6/2	6/5	Africa		341.72						341.72
Commercial airfare							15,757.68				17,757.68
Nicholas A. Ciarlante	5/29	5/31	Africa		970.00				177.27		1,147.27
	5/31	6/1	Africa		783.23						783.23
	6/1	6/2	Africa		240.00						240.00
	6/2	6/5	Africa		341.72						341.72
Commercial airfare							15,234.68				15,234.68
Hon. Mike Turner	5/30	5/31	Europe		227.00				248.66		475.66
	5/31	6/2	Europe		516.00				171.00		687.00
	6/2	6/3	Europe		272.00		95.33		298.66		665.99
Commercial airfare							5,107.06				5,107.06
Damon Nelson	5/29	5/30	Europe		191.00		68.90		361.90		621.80
	5/30	5/31	Europe		227.00				248.66		475.66
	5/31	6/2	Europe		516.00				171.00		687.00
	6/2	6/3	Europe		272.00		95.33		298.66		665.99
Commercial airfare							12,401.96				12,401.96
Lisa Major	5/29	5/30	Europe		191.00		68.90		361.90		621.80
	5/30	5/31	Europe		227.00				248.66		475.66
	5/31	6/2	Europe		516.00				171.00		687.00
	6/2	6/3	Europe		272.00		95.33		298.66		665.99
Commercial airfare							12,401.96				12,401.96
Bill Flanigan	5/29	6/4	Europe		1,440.71				499.38		1,940.09
Commercial airfare							11,173.36				11,173.36
Bob Minehart	5/29	6/4	Europe		1,214.72				499.38		1,714.10
Commercial airfare							11,173.36				11,173.36
Amanda Rogers-Thorpe	5/31	6/2	Europe		745.29				187.00		932.29

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare							9,059.76				9,059.76
Hon. Eric Swalwell	5/31	6/1	Asia		450.66				7.50		458.16
	6/1	6/3	Asia		140.00				88.56		228.56
Commercial airfare							8,197.46				8,197.46
Wells Bennett	5/31	6/1	Asia		450.66				7.50		458.16
	6/1	6/3	Asia		140.00				88.56		228.56
Commercial airfare							13,187.96				13,187.96
Hon. Terri Sewell	6/26	6/30	Australia		996.00		310.00				1,306.00
	6/30	7/3	Oceania		864.00						864.00
Commercial airfare							20,413.56				20,413.56
Linda Cohen	6/26	6/30	Australia		996.00		310.00				1,306.00
	6/30	7/3	Oceania		864.00						864.00
Commercial airfare							20,413.56				20,413.56
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	6/26	6/28	Asia		930.00						930.00
	6/28	6/30	Asia		579.99		166.02		48.51		794.52
Commercial airfare							23,937.56				23,937.56
Damon Nelson	6/26	6/28	Asia		930.00						930.00
	6/28	6/30	Asia		579.99		401.60		48.51		1,030.10
	6/30	7/2	Asia		514.02						514.02
Commercial airfare							21,637.56				21,637.56
George Pappas	6/26	6/28	Asia		930.00						930.00
	6/28	6/30	Asia		579.99		401.60		48.51		1,030.10
	6/30	7/2	Asia		514.02						514.02
Commercial airfare							21,602.56				21,602.56
Shannon Stuart	6/26	6/28	Asia		827.00				53.00		880.00
	6/28	6/29	Asia		320.00				9.69		329.69
	6/29	7/1	Asia		377.29				17.36		394.65
Commercial airfare							18,225.56				18,225.56
Bill Flanigan	6/26	6/28	Asia		827.00				53.00		880.00
	6/28	6/29	Asia		320.00				9.69		329.69
	6/29	7/01	Asia		377.29				17.36		394.65
Commercial airfare							15,107.16				15,107.16
Lisa Major	6/26	6/28	Asia		827.00				53.00		880.00
	6/28	6/29	Asia		320.00				9.69		329.69
	6/29	7/1	Asia		377.29				17.36		394.65
Commercial airfare							15,107.16				15,107.16
Carly Blake	6/26	6/28	Asia		827.00				53.00		880.00
	6/28	6/29	Asia		320.00				9.69		329.69
	6/29	7/01	Asia		377.29				17.36		394.65
Commercial airfare							15,107.16				15,107.16
Michael Ellis	6/27	6/29	Africa		534.00				15.14		549.14
	6/29	7/1	Africa		417.74				17.06		434.80
	7/1	7/3	Europe		561.88						561.88
Commercial airfare							15,982.06				15,982.06
Scott Glabe	6/27	6/29	Africa		534.00				15.14		549.14
	6/29	7/1	Africa		417.74				17.06		434.80
	7/1	7/3	Europe		561.88						561.88
Commercial airfare							11,940.06				11,940.06
Committee total					62,845.82		437,551.14		24,825.06		525,222.02

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, August 1, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TREY GOWDY, Chairman, July 22, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☐											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. KEVIN BRADY, Chairman, July 18, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Shelly Han	4/2	4/10	Georgia		1,835.00		2,695.86				4,530.86
			Armenia	Lari							
Janice Helwig	4/8	6/30	Austria	Euro	29,013.00		11,775.56				40,788.56
	6/4	6/8	Thailand	Baht	492.00		5,610.50				6,102.50

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Allison Hollabaugh	4/10	4/13	Austria	Euro	798.33	3,394.86	4,193.19
.....	6/4	6/10	Japan	Yen	1,752.00	3,359.86	5,111.86
.....	Thailand	Baht
Mischa Thompson	4/13	4/16	Austria	Euro	398.00	1,570.46	1,968.46
.....	5/29	6/3	Italy	Euro	1,467.30	1,869.96	3,337.26
Erika Schlager	5/15	5/21	Bulgaria	Lev	1,355.00	12,324.56	13,679.56
Committee total	37,110.63	42,601.52	79,712.25

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, July 27, 2016.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6772. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, Miscellaneous Program Changes [Docket No.: 2015-ED-OSERS-0002] (RIN: 1820-AB71) September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6773. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — State Vocational Rehabilitation Services program; State Supported Employment Services program; Limitations on Use of Subminimum Wage [ED-2015-OSERS-0001] (RIN: 1820-AB70) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6774. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority and requirement — Equity Assistance Centers [CDFA Number: 84.004D] [Docket ID: ED-2016-OESE-0015] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; NOx Emission Trading Orders as Single Source SIP Revisions [EPA-R01-OAR-2015-0238; FRL-9951-94-Region 1] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for Areas in Georgia and Florida [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0918; FRL-9951-91-OAR] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6777. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indiana Portion of

the Louisville Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0698; FRL-9951-95-Region 5] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2016-0313; FRL-9951-87-Region 7] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Puerto Rico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2008 Ozone, 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R02-OAR-2016-0060; FRL-9945-84-Region 2] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0235; FRL-9950-04] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0790; FRL-9951-64-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS10) received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0151, 0152, 0154, 0155, 0156, 0157 and 0158; EPA-HQ-SFUND-2015-0139, 0575 and 0576; FRL-9952-06-OLEM] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6783. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's direct final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Maryland [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0568; FRL-9950-98-Region 3] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6784. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — State of Iowa; Approval and Promulgation of the Title V Operating Permits Program, the State Implementation Plan, and 112(1) Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2016-0453; FRL-9951-86-Region 7] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6785. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles — Phase 2 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0827; NHTSA-2014-0132; FRL-9950-25-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS16; RIN: 2127-AL52) received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6786. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification regarding the proposed transfer from the Government of Jordan to a U.S. private entity, Transmittal No.: RSAT-16-5068, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2753(d); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 3(d) (as amended by Public Law 107-228, Sec. 1405(a)(1)(A)) (116 Stat. 1456); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6787. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a possible or actual unauthorized transfer of defense articles provided by the United States, pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6788. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification of a possible or actual unauthorized transfer of defense articles provided by the United States, pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6789. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's interim final rule — Interpretation, Exemptions and Waiver Guidance Concerning 18 U.S.C. 208 (Acts Affecting A Personal Financial Interest); Amendment to Definition of "Employee" (RIN: 3209-AA09) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6790. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed draft resolution approving the location of the National Desert Storm War Memorial; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6791. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Eliminating Business Purpose and Device as No-Rules under Section 355 (Rev. Proc. 2016-45) received September 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6792. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, *United States of America v. Nicolas Epskamp*, docket no. 15-2028; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6793. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31087; Amdt. No. 3705] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6794. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping: Modification of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Offshore of Charleston, South Carolina [EPA-R04-OW-2016-0356; FRL-9951-96-Region 4] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6795. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Annual report the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(b)(6); August 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(b)(6) (as amended by Public Law 97-35, Sec. 1122); (95 Stat. 638); ; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 921. A bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; with an amendment (Rept. 114-736, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4979. A bill to foster civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies and enhance the licensing and commercial deployment of such technologies; with an amendment (Rept. 114-737, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4782. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. House Joint Resolution 87. Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to "Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act" (Rept. 114-739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2817. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Historic Preservation Fund; with an amendment (Rept. 114-740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 858. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3590) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the income threshold used in determining the deduction for medical care (Rept. 114-741). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 859. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5620) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-742). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 921 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4979 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5992. A bill to amend section 203(b)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to implement new reforms, and to reauthorize the EB-5 Regional Center Program, in order to promote and reform foreign capital investment and job creation in communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHFORD:

H.R. 5993. A bill to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for airline accommodations which are not coach-class accommodations, to prohibit the use of official funds for long-term vehicle leases for Members of Congress, to prohibit the use of the Members' Representational Allowance for expenses of official mail of any material other than a document transmitted under the official letterhead of the Member involved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend biodiesel and renewable diesel incentives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 5995. A bill to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5996. A bill to provide United States support for the full implementation of the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5997. A bill to establish the Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 5998. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for retroactive calculation since the start of combat operations in Afghanistan of days of certain active duty or active service performed as a member of the Ready Reserve to reduce the eligibility age for receipt of retired pay for non-regular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 5999. A bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 857. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 12 through 16, 2016 as "National Family Service Learning Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 860. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the firefight that occurred on March 4, 2007, between members of the United States Marine Corps and enemy forces in Bati Kot District, Nangarhar Province, Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 861. A resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 5992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ASHFORD:

H.R. 5993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 5996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;"

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide the . . . general welfare of the United States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 5998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 5999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 213: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 265: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 565: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 605: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 664: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 672: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 793: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 921: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 969: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1025: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1061: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1062: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1076: Mr. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1220: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1292: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1453: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1516: Ms. JUDY CHU Of California.

H.R. 1559: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1594: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1674: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1866: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1877: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1942: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 2058: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2096: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2102: Mr. HINES.

H.R. 2169: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2368: Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2513: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 2519: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 2530: Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 2759: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2799: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2902: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 2903: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2944: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2962: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 2972: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3051: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3084: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 3187: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 3235: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 3276: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3277: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3438: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. Abraham.

H.R. 3512: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3588: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3693: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3742: Mr. BLUM, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 3765: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3849: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3957: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 4137: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 4151: Mr. KATKO and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 4212: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4333: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4365: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 4514: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4626: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 4657: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4681: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 4695: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4715: Mr. HANNA and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 4773: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 4784: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 4829: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 4893: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4919: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 4927: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4928: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 5002: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5015: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 5067: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 5073: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 5083: Mr. JONES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5187: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 5219: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 5271: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 5321: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 5350: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5351: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 5455: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 5488: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 5499: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 5506: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5513: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 5589: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 5601: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5619: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 5620: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 5621: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5675: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 5682: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 5689: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5691: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 5720: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 5732: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 5813: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 5859: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 5862: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5883: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 5904: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 5931: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 5941: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 5942: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BARR, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 5948: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5958: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 5970: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 5980: Mrs. LOVE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 5987: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. FLEMING.

H. Con. Res. 114: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. ROUZER.

H. Con. Res. 146: Mr. ROKITA.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. HANNA, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 28: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H. Res. 220: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 265: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H. Res. 296: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 424: Mr. SANFORD.

H. Res. 667: Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 729: Mr. HONDA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 750: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H. Res. 782: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 798: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H. Res. 807: Mr. GALLEGGO.

H. Res. 808: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 813: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 831: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 840: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H. Res. 850: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. YODER.

H. Res. 852: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. TURNER.

H. Res. 853: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COOK, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MILLER, or a designee, to H.R. 5620, the VA Accountability First and Appeals Modernization Act of 2016, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.